

torney General; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. ABZUG (for herself, Mr. BADILLO, Mrs. BURKE of California, Mr. BURTON, Mr. CLAY, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. FRASER, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland, Mr. PODELL, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. STARK, Mr. STOKES, Mr. WALDIE, and Mr. YOUNG of Georgia):

H. Res. 650. Resolution impeaching Richard M. Nixon, President of the United States, for high crimes and misdemeanors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KOCH:

H. Res. 651. Resolution directing the Committee on the Judiciary to inquire into and investigate whether grounds exist for the

impeachment of Richard M. Nixon; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mrs. MINK:

H. Res. 652. Resolution impeaching Richard M. Nixon, President of the United States, of high crimes and misdemeanors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOAKLEY (for himself and Mr. BADILLO):

H. Res. 653. Resolution to express the sense of the House that there will be no action on the nomination for Vice President until such time as the President has complied with the final decision of the court system as it relates to the White House tapes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROE:

H. Res. 654. Resolution directing the Committee on the Judiciary to inquire into and

investigate whether grounds exist for the impeachment of Richard M. Nixon; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mrs. BURKE of California:

H.R. 11102. A bill for the relief of Tze Tsun Lee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURTON:

H.R. 11103. A bill for the relief of Lella M. Eitz (Dieu Thi Minh Nguyet); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

WALTER HARNISCHFEGER: A
GREAT AMERICAN PASSES

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 24, 1973

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, on September 21, 1973, the United States lost one of its most distinguished citizens with the death in Milwaukee, Wisconsin, of Walter Harnischfeger at the age 77. Free men everywhere are poorer for his passing.

Walter Harnischfeger's long and distinguished career as one of this country's most enterprising industrialists spanned a period of more than 60 years from the time he began work as an apprentice at 10 cents an hour until his retirement as chairman of the board of the Harnischfeger Corp., one of the Nation's leading manufacturers of construction equipment.

It was my pleasure and privilege to have known this great American over a period of years and I can say without hesitation that his friendship was one of my most valued possessions.

He was tireless in his advocacy of the sound principle that fiscal sanity must be practiced by government, just as it must be practiced by prudent individuals everywhere.

For those whose lives were not directly enriched by Walter Harnischfeger, I include for insertion in the RECORD at this point a brief biography:

BIOGRAPHY OF WALTER HARNISCHFEGER

Walter Harnischfeger was born in 1895, the son of Henry Harnischfeger, one of the two co-founders of the Harnischfeger Corporation.

He began his business career in his father's firm as a ten-cent-an-hour apprentice at the age of 16. After serving several years as an apprentice in the shop, engineering, estimating, and service departments, he became a salesman and began a series of assignments requiring extensive travel throughout the United States and abroad. From that time on, Walter Harnischfeger was a ceaseless world traveler and a perceptive student of industry and politics in many quarters of the globe.

Largely self-educated, Harnischfeger acquired some formal education by attending night school during his apprentice years. This led to an interest in "learn-while-working" educational institutions, such as the Mil-

waukee School of Engineering. Harnischfeger took a deep interest in this school and eventually became Chairman of its Board of Regents. For many years his generosity and enthusiasm were keystones in the school's steady growth.

Upon the death of his father in 1930, Walter Harnischfeger became President of the firm and in 1959 became Chairman of the Board.

For many years, Harnischfeger conducted a tireless campaign seeking to encourage a sound fiscal operation in the government. He argued that the public pocket was not bottomless and that even the government had to conduct its affairs in a business-like manner within its income. He declared "give-away" programs, yet he encouraged aid to the underprivileged countries of the world through sound investment programs which enabled the people in those countries to help themselves. As a result of this attitude, the Harnischfeger Corporation became international in operation with eight overseas manufacturing plants making substantial contributions to the economies and welfare of communities in Germany, Japan, Canada, Australia, Chile and Brazil.

Mr. Harnischfeger has long been recognized for his intense interest in people, places and current events. He was a world traveler and an avid champion and believer in the rights and dignity of the individual.

HIS ACTIVITIES INCLUDED

Member of the Board of Trustees of the American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research, Washington, D.C.

Member of the Board of Directors of the American Institute for Foreign Trade, Phoenix, Arizona.

Member of the Board of the Milwaukee Chapter of the American Red Cross.

Tustee of America's Future, Inc., New Rochelle, New York.

Member of the Board of Directors of the Boys' Clubs of America, New York, New York.

Former National Chairman and Honorary Chairman of the Citizens Foreign Aid Committee, Washington, D.C.

Member of the Advisory Board of the Committee for Constitutional Government, New York, New York.

Member of the Federal Finance Committee of the Council of State Chambers of Commerce. Formerly Chairman of the Committee for Constitutional Government, New York, New York.

Member of the Federal Finance Committee of the Council of State Chambers of Commerce. Formerly Chairman of the Committee on Federal Expenditures.

Member of the Board of Directors of the Far East-America Council of Commerce and Industry, Inc., New York, New York.

Member of the Greater Milwaukee Committee for Community Development.

Member of the Board of Trustees and Ex-

cutive Committee of the Herbert Hoover Birthplace Foundation, Inc., West Branch, Iowa.

Member of the Advisory Board of Leader Dogs for the Blind, Rochester, Michigan.

Member of the Board of Trustees and Governors of the Menninger Foundation, Topeka, Kansas.

Honorary Chairman of the Board of Regents of the Milwaukee School of Engineering. Formerly Chairman of the Board of Regents.

Member of the Finance Committee of the National Association of Manufacturers. Former Director.

Director of National Economic Council, Inc., New York, New York.

Member of the Executive Committee of the International Section of the New York Board of Trade, Formerly Vice Chairman.

Member of the New York Chamber of Commerce.

Member of Omicron Delta Alpha.

Trustee of the Pestalozzi Foundation of America, Inc., New York, New York.

Trustee of the United States Inter-American Council and Member of the Executive Committee, New York, New York.

Former Member of the Advisory Committee of the Federal Reserve Bank—7th District, Chicago, Illinois.

Former Director and Chairman of the National Affairs Committee of the Milwaukee Association of Commerce.

Former member of the National Defense Committee of the United States Chamber of Commerce.

Former Director of the Wisconsin Manufacturers' Association.

Mr. Harnischfeger served as a Delegate to the Congress of the International Chamber of Commerce at Lisbon, Portugal; Vienna, Austria; Naples, Italy; and Copenhagen, Denmark.

Mr. Speaker, one who knew him well, Mr. Eugene F. Rinta, executive director of the Council of State Chambers of Commerce, wrote as follows to members of the Council on Mr. Harnischfeger's death:

STATEMENT OF MR. EUGENE F. RINTA

Many of you knew "W. H." as an active member of the Council's Federal Finance Committee and a regular attendee at the Council's annual meetings until just a few years ago when his health began to fail. A few of you know that he was the first Chairman of our Federal Expenditures Subcommittee and that, ever since the Council became active in national affairs after World War II, he was one of the most active and loyal participants and supporters that the Council has ever had.

I, personally, have had the privilege of association and friendship with Walter Harnischfeger for almost 25 years, not only

during our committee meetings but more so during innumerable luncheons and dinners with only a few, if any, others present. To me he was much more than an eminently successful industrialist, of which this nation has many. He was the most public-spirited citizen I have known. He did not favor causes commonly characterized as the "do-gooder" approach. Instead, he was a vigorous advocate of government fiscal policies and other measures designed to produce sound economic growth with stable prices to the benefit of all.

Through his extensive travels on all continents, he many years ago became aware of the futility and waste of our foreign aid programs. Typically, he let his views be known and he testified on numerous occasions before Senate and House committees responsible for the annual foreign aid bills. Similarly, he has consistently called for elimination of wastes in defense and domestic non-defense spending and for better overall spending control.

A tribute that well describes W. H. was expressed in January 1960 by his good friend, the late former President Herbert Hoover. Mr. Hoover said:

"I have enjoyed the friendship of Walter Harnischfeger over many years.

"He is one of the most sturdy of Americans. He has built up a large enterprise from the grass roots in true American fashion. He has a great knowledge of our foreign relations from frequent study on the ground in nations abroad. He has devoted a large part of his fortune to charity and the promotion of public welfare.

"In sum, Walter Harnischfeger is the Uncommon Man which the American way of life creates."

Truly the nation has lost a great citizen and the Council has lost a great friend.

Mr. Speaker, to me the most fitting epitaph to Walter Harnischfeger is one he might well have written himself. It goes like this:

Life did not pass me by.

I passed by it.

Fully aware that my place only filled the space left by someone before me, and that it would be filled by another after I was gone.

My purpose, while here, was to take the place given me, to fill it with what I could to help my family, my friends, my country and my company.

To you who might fill my space when I am gone I say . . . do what your conscience dictates, say what your mind believes, influence favorably those whom you meet, and accept the fact that you are mortal. Mourn my passing only to the extent that my passing by influenced you. And, after you have briefly mourned, move on.

REQUEST FOR COMMEMORATIVE STAMP

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 24, 1973

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, the United States during the course of history has been proud of its achievements of producing the highest level of educational excellence among its citizenry. The reason for this is partially due to the high caliber of our institutions of higher education. One of the foremost leaders in this field has been Hunter College of New York.

Hunter College has submitted a request to the Citizens Stamp Advisory Council to have a commemorative stamp

issued to honor the college. I feel this request is worthy of favorable consideration in light of the following facts.

Hunter College was the first institute to offer free higher education for women. In addition, it was the first public institution to establish a free kindergarten in the United States.

Hunter College throughout its long and illustrious history has always been in the forefront of civic, community, and even international life. Without a doubt, Hunter College's single most distinguished honor was its being chosen as the first seat of the United Nations during the first days of the world body's existence. Hunter College has made its influence felt in the community as well as with the establishment, by their alumni association of the Lenox Hill Neighborhood Settlement House and Northrop Camp for underprivileged children.

Hunter College also points with pride to her distinguished list of alumni. Included on this impressive list is my colleague from New York, Ms. BELLA ABZUG, as well as Bess Myerson, former consumer affairs commissioner for the city of New York. The alumni list of Hunter College reads like a veritable "Who's Who" of prominent individuals in all major professions.

In light of these significant credentials, I recommend that they write to the Citizens Stamp Advisory Council and urge them to issue this commemorative stamp. Hunter College has provided quality education for over 100 years, and the issuance of this stamp would be a fitting tribute to the unique contributions and historic firsts this institution has made to the educational history of the United States.

VETERANS DAY CELEBRATION IN BIRMINGHAM

HON. BILL NICHOLS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 24, 1973

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, at America's largest Veterans Day celebration in Birmingham, Ala., on Monday, Gen. Creighton W. Abrams gave a speech that captured the feelings of the American public toward the country's role in preserving world peace.

General Abrams, long recognized as one of the finest members of our military service, supported the feelings of détente that the Government has established with other world powers. He did not stop here though but further explained that to keep a lasting peace we must keep a strong military to protect us from coercive threats.

I submit General Abrams' speech to the RECORD for I feel the remarks merit the reading of all Members of Congress:

ADDRESS BY GEN. CREIGHTON W. ABRAMS, CHIEF OF STAFF, U.S. ARMY, WORLD PEACE LUNCHEON, BIRMINGHAM, ALA., MONDAY, OCTOBER 22, 1973

It is a pleasure for me to be here, among so many people who have come together to honor our veterans. It is especially gratifying at a time when it sometimes seems that in the heat of debate and discussion about our policies, the sacrifices of those who fought

for their country are forgotten. It is a rare opportunity indeed, for me—or for any officer in the United States Army—to be able to talk directly with so many people about their Army—our Army. I appreciate this chance to tell you how I see the Army today, and how it fits into the world picture.

The environment today is a difficult one for the country's security. The word "détente" has gained some currency.

"Détente" is expressed by some as a fact. It is applauded by others as a policy.

It is saluted by still others as a new era.

And it provides the basis—at least the semantic basis—for some who would reduce military capabilities to what I believe would be a dangerous level, some who desire that we withdraw out of hand large numbers of troops deployed in Europe against very real and very capable opposing forces, and some whose philosophies discourage young men and women from serving their country in its Armed Forces.

I think it's fair to say that we may be enjoying the beginnings of détente—but we do not have world peace. For some people, the fact that we, ourselves, are not at war may be peace enough. But unless we can lessen the threat of war everywhere in the world, we cannot have a stable, durable peace in which we can depend.

Détente is an idea, a perception of intentions among countries. As such, it is not an objective fact. It can change as quickly as perceptions change. But we must deal in facts—in the reality of power, of capability, of strength—when we are addressing the Nation's security. We should not cast off the dream of peace—God help us if we lost that vision. We should not ignore the hope that possible détente offers, and all the benefits it could bring to mankind. But neither should we lose sight of the real threats and the real dangers where they exist, and of our need to be prepared for them.

We do not have world peace. We do not have peace in any Utopian sense. Nor do we have peace in the down-to-earth sense of a greatly lessened need for our military forces. Yet, today, less than a year after the last U.S. ground combat forces were brought home from Southeast Asia, our Army is less than half the size it was at the peak of our effort there. We are many divisions smaller, and we have fewer weapons. These are in the facts and realities of our capability.

It is also interesting to observe that we are the only major power to have reduced our forces in Europe in the past decade. The Warsaw Pact nations, and the Soviet Union itself, have not reduced their forces. The fact is, in past years, the Warsaw Pact forces have grown steadily and at a rather impressive rate. Again, possible détente—but not assured peace. And again, the delicate balance between hope—human hope—and reality.

In my period of service, which includes the span of three wars, I can tell you that I don't need or want any more war—but then I could have made the same statement a month after I arrived in Europe in 1944. Nobody in his right mind welcomes war, especially those who have seen it. The carnage, the destruction, the pain are beyond telling. But the less prepared we are, the more wishful our thinking, the greater the costs of war when it comes.

I came into the Army in 1936. Where I was, we were a horseback and rifle Army in a country that was still largely convinced that we couldn't have another World War. The idea that we had ended the possibility of war at Versailles blinded many of us to reality. We had heard that there was a German Army, but we ignored the facts in our desire for peace—until we were forced into action. And you know what happened. We did not prepare. When we could no longer avoid it, we got thrown into a huge war in Europe—unready, ill-trained in many respects, saved only by distance and the time bought by our Allies' efforts. In the Pacific, we have Pearl Harbor

and Bataan to remember for our complacent outlook. The cost was dreadful. In Europe, in Africa, in the Pacific we paid and paid and paid again—in lives and in blood—for our unpreparedness; we paid for our insistence that because our shores were not under direct attack, we were at peace.

When that war ended, we erased history again.

When the Korean War broke out, our situation was not much different than it had been in the opening days of the Second World War. We were not prepared. We were not adequately trained. We were not adequately equipped. But we entered the war rapidly, throwing half-ready units in to buy time for the Army to get ready. And again, during those early days in Korea, we paid dearly for our unpreparedness with our most precious asset: the lives of men.

The monuments we raised to heroism and sacrifice in each of these wars are really surrogates for the monuments we owe ourselves; monuments for our blindness to reality, for our indifference to real threats to our security, for our determination to deal in intentions and perceptions, and for our wishful thinking about how war could not come.

In this period of possible détente—not real peace, but possible détente—we are opposed by formidable strength. We face, at various places around the world, strong and capable adversaries, becoming stronger all the time. These are facts. As our relations throughout the world improve, we should consider that we have more and more to gain by preventing another war, and there is only one way I know of to do that. The only way that really ever has worked is for us to maintain our own strength, our capability and our own resolve to defend our security, our freedom, and those of our Allies.

And so for the Army today, this means we must be ready, prepared to stand for our country. Insuring that the Army is prepared is my most fundamental duty, and it is the Army's mission today, as always.

For the Army to be prepared, we must look beyond the countable, measurable indicators of preparedness. We must look to a spirit of preparedness. A "ready" spirit is a precious commodity for our Army: it gives credibility to our strength. And by our credible strength we assure our friends and deter our enemies in the interests of peace.

We hold and nurture and support this precious spirit everywhere in the Army—and we anxiously look for it elsewhere in the country. For this spirit of readiness cannot be sustained by the Army alone. It must have its roots in the rest of the country, or it cannot survive. There must be clear evidence throughout the country that we, as a Nation, are prepared, that we have the spirit and will do what is necessary to defend the country, and to insure its well-being. We must hear the people express their determination:

To support the efforts of our Army,

To meet the needs of the country,

And to avoid the terrible costs of being prepared too late or not at all.

The spirit of preparedness must resound so that any potential enemy can discern it, and can see that he cannot set out on a cheap adventure at our expense.

We cannot do this from the reclining position. We cannot say, "If you start something with us, we will spring to arms," for there will be too little time to begin to get ready. We must be far more committed, far more dedicated, far more prepared than that.

Each time we have faced major war unprepared, we have barely gotten ready in time, and the costs have been atrocious and a disgrace to this Nation. With the support of the people of this Nation, we should not have to pay that price again.

I have faith in this country, and its people. And of course, I have faith in our Army. We have met challenge upon challenge, at home and overseas, in ways that only a Nation of great spirit could have met them. If we set

ourselves to the task of preparing for war if it comes, of being ready to meet the challenge of war before it is upon us, we shall be achieving the real peace that men everywhere can understand, and that nations everywhere can respect. Other men have given greatly of themselves for this peace. We cannot let them down.

GIVING THE COMPUTER A CONSCIENCE

HON. H. JOHN HEINZ III

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 24, 1973

Mr. HEINZ. Mr. Speaker, the mushrooming data banks that will store law enforcement information on over 50 million Americans pose an obvious threat to their civil liberties. Doubtless, we are beginning to see evidence that data banks, unguarded and uncontrolled, can cause embarrassment or even severe economic hardship to individuals in this country.

The current issue of Harper's magazine carries a provocative article on the dangers of data banks by J. Taylor DeWeese. A native of my own Pittsburgh and a distinguished young attorney now working in Philadelphia, he is also a member of the Federal Advisory Committee on Data Banks. "Tate," who has been helpful in answering a number of my questions on this subject, suggests that we control the computer and give it a conscience in order to protect the rights of our citizens who become involved with law enforcement agencies. I respectfully insert the reprinting of the article, which follows:

GIVING THE COMPUTER A CONSCIENCE

(By J. Taylor DeWeese)

Two of every five American males will be arrested on a nontraffic charge at some time in their lives. For urban residents, it's three out of five; for blacks, four out of five. A Presidential Commission on Law Enforcement estimates that at this rate some 50 million Americans will have criminal arrest records by the end of the decade.

When they are arrested, their names will be sent to a local data center, then forwarded to the FBI computer at the National Crime Information Center (NCIC) in Washington. There, the record will be encoded on magnetic tape and fed into a data bank that can be instantaneously accessible to employers, police, courts, and credit bureaus at the push of a button on any of some 40,000 remote-access terminals scattered across the country. A "criminal" record for each person remains in the system forever—even if the charges are dismissed, or the matter is referred to the juvenile courts, or the convicted offender is fully rehabilitated.

The Federal Law Enforcement Assistance Administration has spent nearly \$90 million to create more than one hundred local data banks. The FBI began feeding criminal histories into its computer last year, and hopes to have the entire national network of local data centers operational by 1975.

The mushrooming data banks that will store law-enforcement information on over 50 million Americans pose an obvious threat to civil liberties. For, despite the presumption of innocence written into the Constitution and the Judeo-Christian doctrine of redemption, a person once accused of a crime is permanently relegated to second-class citizenship. His chances of gaining lawful employment, credit, insurance, education, and community acceptance are greatly dimin-

ished. For the person once convicted, these opportunities are often extinguished altogether.

The potential for injury is magnified by the very real possibility that a person's record will be inaccurate or misleading. One-third of the FBI's records are incomplete because local courts and police agencies have failed to submit the final disposition of the charge. Why the FBI continues to broadcast records it knows are inaccurate remains a mystery.

Even more disturbing, many people who have never been associated with a crime will find their names on record. The local crime computer in Kansas City, Missouri, for example, contains the following questionable categories of information: local and national intelligence subjects, college students known to have participated in disturbances, persons with a history of mental illness, persons suspected of shoplifting, persons who have confronted or opposed government officials. Thus, an individual who has merely sought medical treatment or appeared "suspicious" may find himself in files labeled "criminal justice information." The slipshod standards in Kansas City are especially disturbing, because the system was built up during the tenure of police chief Clarence M. Kelley—who is now director of the FBI.

In the past, the inefficiencies of traditional record-keeping gave individuals at least some hope of escaping their past and starting a fresh life. Records scattered across the geographic landscape were lost, buried, or simply inaccessible. A person had a second chance—if only by default.

Today, the growing network of computer record repositories guarantees the immortality of past charges, offenses, and suspicions. The data banks will become a kind of prison—a "record prison"—as the computer with its indefatigable memory and its instantaneous recall locks many into their status as criminal offenders and walls them off from the rest of society. For the record prisoner there is no possibility of parole or time off for good behavior, and no hope of release.

To avoid this scenario, we cannot and need not pull the plug on the computers. Ironically, the same technology that magnifies the potential for abuse offers some opportunities to safeguard individual rights. Computers can be programmed to forget as well as to remember. Complex schemes for expunging names that would have taken hundreds of clerks thousands of man-hours to accomplish can easily be programmed into the computer and performed automatically in a matter of seconds. Codes and passwords can be built into modern data systems to prevent unauthorized access. The computer's memory can be compartmentalized so that users with the right password can get certain information but not other portions of the data. In short, the National Crime Information Center can be programmed to police itself.

Effective controls on the computer must address the threshold issue. Namely, certain classes of personal information—because of their questionable value to law enforcement, their private nature, and their potential for harmful misuse—should be excluded outright from data banks. Legislation should prohibit the inclusion of political surveillance data in the NCIC or its federally funded counterparts at the state and local levels. The retention of such information has a chilling effect on the full expression of First Amendment political rights.

The data banks should be permitted to collect and disseminate only information of an official nature. Raw, unverified intelligence data and informant reports should be excluded. Similarly, all medical information, including records of mental health treatment and narcotics rehabilitation, should be prohibited.

Official criminal justice information should exclude all data on youth arrests and juvenile court proceedings as well as lower-level

brushes with the law, such as vagrancy, drunkenness, traffic violations, and disorderly conduct.

All information that is retained should be carefully screened for accuracy and periodically "cleansed" to remove stale data. The precise provisions of any scheme will generate considerable controversy and will be the product of debate and compromise. Therefore, the following suggestions are designed merely to illustrate the principles at work in striking a balance between the interests of law enforcement and those of the individual.

In determining the length of time data should be stored, it would be helpful to differentiate between the two categories of users: "insiders" and "outsiders." "Insiders" are law-enforcement officials using the system for strictly law-enforcement purposes—the solution of a specified crime, setting bail, determining a sentence. "Outsiders" are licensing agencies, employers, credit bureaus, insurance companies—those who are interested in a person's past as a predictor of present character.

When an individual suspected of a crime is apprehended by the police, a record of his arrest would be entered in the data system. However, it should be sealed to "outsiders" and disseminated only to law-enforcement users.

If the individual has no previous convictions and is acquitted of the present charge, the arrest record should be sealed to all users after a probationary period of two years. If the individual is convicted of a new crime during the probation period, his previous arrest would become a permanent part of his record for law-enforcement use. However, only the conviction portion of his record would be disseminated to outsiders.

Likewise, if the individual had a previous conviction, the record of his arrest would be permanently retained for law-enforcement use, but the nonconviction portion of his criminal history would be sealed to outsiders.

In short, all arrests not resulting in conviction would be sealed to employers, licensing agencies, and other outsiders. If an individual had no previous convictions and had a clean record for two years following his arrest, his arrest record would be sealed to all users. If his record was clean for four years, the arrest record would be expunged altogether.

In response to such schemes, law-enforcement officials may contend that the retention of an arrest record serves the legitimate needs of law enforcement even when the individual has no previous conviction. There is some support for this contention. Acquittal means only that the defendant was not proven guilty beyond a reasonable doubt. It can result from the death of a single witness or the illegal seizure of evidence. With this in mind, the drafters of remedial legislation should consider including a provision allowing the police to make application to a federal court for an order authorizing the continued maintenance of an arrest record for law-enforcement purposes. This relief should be exceptional and should be granted only in those cases in which the petition has substantially shown the existence of special circumstances. In the case of the individual who has never been convicted of a crime, the possibility that arrest data will be leaked to outsiders warrants the sealing and ultimate destruction of nonconviction records in the absence of exceptional circumstances.

Arrest records are only one dimension of the problem. Programs should also be designed for expunging the records of convicted first offenders and of offenders with multiple convictions, although the probationary periods should be must longer.

The thoughtful application of computer technology will also help preserve distinctions between authorized and unauthorized

use. Manual record-keeping often made efforts to regulate use meaningless. Files marked "sealed" or "for official use only" afford the individual little real protection. Computers offer new safeguards. Think of the data base of a computer's memory as a tree with data leaves on its various branches. Data of varying sensitivities can be stored in different leaves. As a user passes through the hierarchy of memory, the computer can run an automatic check on the user's security clearance to determine if he is authorized to proceed into that area of the memory bank. For instance, the computer could be programmed to grant outsiders access to conviction data while denying them arrest information.

To help ensure observance of the insider-outsider distinction, all criminal data systems should be under the control of a disinterested agency that is neither an insider nor an outside user of criminal records.

The FBI is definitely not a disinterested agency, and its indiscriminate data collection has received so much detailed criticism that one state—Massachusetts—refused to become part of the National Crime Information Center. This decision cost Massachusetts dearly in lost federal funds, but state officials nevertheless resolved not to participate in a system with such a loose regard for individual rights. They recognized a principle that should apply to all computer crime networks—that unproven accusations, ancient transgressions long since expiated by responsible conduct, and inaccurate and misleading information should not be indiscriminately broadcast under governmental auspices.

The reality of the modern computer closely resembles the heartless nature of Omar Khayyam's Moving Finger which, "having writ, / Moves on: nor all thy Piety nor Wit / Shall lure it back to cancel half a Line, / Nor all thy Tears wash out a word of it." Like the Moving Finger, computers lack the inherent ability to forget, to forgive, to understand.

By giving the computer a conscience, we can give many more Americans a chance for a fresh start and a new life.

ARE POSTAL CHANGES FOR THE BETTER?

HON. BILL ALEXANDER

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 24, 1973

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, no example better illustrates the truth of the saying that not all changes are for the good than the actions of our Postal Service. I would like to share with my colleagues at this point a letter from two of my constituents commenting on the mail service between their city in eastern Arkansas and the State university in the extreme western portion of the State:

HELENA, ARK.,
October 17, 1973.

HON. WILLIAM ALEXANDER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: We are writing to inform you of the poor mail service from Helena to other points in Arkansas. Our son is a student at the Univ. of Ark. at Fayetteville and it takes two days for a letter to reach him from Helena. The reason for this is that all mail leaving Helena is sent to Memphis where it is resorted and then sent to points in Arkansas. We do not have direct mail service from Helena to Little Rock which we did have up until a few months ago.

We wish that something could be done to improve all mail service.

Sincerely,

BARTON G. WELLBORN,
ELIZABETH WELLBORN.

IS THE DOOR CLOSED?

HON. E. G. SHUSTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 24, 1973

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, the tragedy of the Vice President has evoked criticism and shock, sympathy and disillusionment, from every strata of our society. Indeed, such emotions are justified, but the real tragedy may not yet be uncovered.

The real tragedy may be those young, talented, and aspiring public servants who may choose to drop out of public life rather than be subjected to constant pressures by their financial supporters. The real tragedy may be those candidates who cannot afford to finance a campaign and who have to rely on the contributions of their supporters, for such contributions may dwindle quickly rather than undergo constant and threatening scrutiny.

Our political system has suffered a jolt. But we cannot allow the quality of government to suffer as a result. Steps must be taken to insure that each and every qualified candidate for public office be given the same opportunity, the same chance to be elected.

Mr. Speaker, the Altoona Mirror, a daily newspaper in my congressional district with a circulation of approximately 36,000, has recognized this manifestation of the Vice President's tragedy, and had an excellent editorial in the October 20, 1973, issue. I insert at this time the editorial in the RECORD, so that all may share in the remarks of this enlightened newspaper:

IS THE DOOR CLOSED?

Is the door to high public office now closed to the sons and daughters of the poor, the middle class and even the moderately well-to-do citizens of the United States? Is the lock to that door contrived so that only the golden key of the multimillionaire will open it? Has the party that has always claimed to be most interested in the poor, the working people, the minority groups now adopted the theory that only the very, very rich have the right to select from their own group those who are to head this nation?

The persecution as well as the prosecution of Spiro T. Agnew as vice president of these United States raises these serious questions. Are those who proclaim themselves as liberals really liberal in the ordinary sense of the word? Or are they more interested in building an autocracy in this nation than in preserving it as a democracy? How long can they fool so many people into thinking that those who possess great material wealth are the only ones fitted for high office?

The son of the hard-working but poor Greek immigrant possessed a real political talent. It might have been buried forever if some of his friends had not encouraged him with gifts of money and influence, for even the smaller political offices are won by campaigns, and campaigns need money. Not all political contributions are made in the expectation of getting favors in return for the donations. Sometimes friends and neighbors

just like to see a young politician get ahead in his chosen profession.

As the young politician rises in stature and the jobs become larger, the costs of getting elected also rise. Corporations are forbidden to give campaign contributions, but organized labor groups are not. Neither are those millionaires to whom the big political contribution is merely "pocket money." Fund-raising for candidates is usually turned over to people who have the ability to raise funds, and candidates are not always aware of the ways by which such funds are raised.

"The new morality" seems to suggest that the candidate is responsible for everything that happens in his campaign. They seem to forget that most candidates spend all their strength and thought in the campaign itself. They exhaust their physical energy shaking hands, making speeches, rushing hither and yon to "meet the people," but somehow they are supposed to also know all that is going on in the other campaign to raise funds for them and for their party.

"The new morality" can forgive a man whose companion drowns while he escapes from the same car and "forgets" to report the accident until all hope for the trapped companion is gone. He can escape questions at an inquest. He can escape questions when he is reelected to high public office. His family has money.

We do not condone the buying of political favors. Neither do we think a government expenditure of tax money to finance elections would be a safe way to insure fair elections. We do not believe that big unions should contribute great sums of money to buy influence at all levels of government from dues extracted from the working people. We do believe that all those who cherish real democracy, who want the door open for men of talent, should reexamine their own capacity to give money and effort toward the election of those in whom they believe.

Isn't it about time our two great political parties quit name-calling, mud-slinging and character assassination and get back to clear-cut political objectives that define the party stand on leading questions?

Keep the door open for those whose talents for political leadership outweigh the circumstances of their birth.

MADRIGAL SINGERS

HON. HENRY P. SMITH III

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 24, 1973

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Speaker, in these times of international tensions, it is encouraging to hear of efforts to dispel the image of the "ugly American" and promote good will.

Sixteen boys and girls from my district, calling themselves the Madrigal Singers of LaSalle Senior High School, toured Romania for 3 weeks this summer. Recently, the supervisor of music for Niagara Falls public schools, James E. Buffan, received a letter from Charles Abdoo, president of American Youth Performs, Inc., sponsors of the tour.

It is obvious that the small group of Madrigal Singers from Niagara Falls has won the hearts of the Romanian people.

Mr. Abdoo said:

And, this tour probably did more to cement better relations between the United States and Romania than anything that has happened to date.

We were glad to sing for anyone who asked us.

The youngsters say they sang not only in scheduled concerts, but in restaurants and hotel lobbies and even while walking down the street during their sightseeing tours.

Their joy and enthusiasm were contagious to the Romanian people.

Mrs. Margaret C. Bowen, LaSalle music teacher, says of her group:

Wherever we went people stopped to watch or join in our activities.

The Madrigal Singers were born about 3 years ago as an extracurricular, after-school activity. The students raised funds for their trip through donations from area corporations and individuals, community concerts, sales of bumper stickers and buttons, raffles, and a dinner dance.

I applaud and thank the Madrigal Singers: Marlisa Bach, Sherry Brothers, Cynthia Conmy, Robert Crouch, Susan Fallon, Barbara Gruver, Hillard Harris, Wayne Heck, Majorie Horne, Mary Ellen Illig, Matthew Keller, William Potter, Suzanne Ranchil, Linda Reisig, Lois Stipp, and William Woods.

Also, those who accompanied them deserve praise:

Mrs. Bowen, Miss Judith Ottaviani, the Rev. Vincent Verrastro, Terence Brown, and Bonnie Milburn.

ISRAEL IS NOT VIETNAM

HON. WILLIAM LEHMAN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 24, 1973

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. Speaker, the President has requested that the Congress authorize emergency security assistance for Israel.

There are many reasons for American support for Israel and for the judgment that Israel is different from South Vietnam.

South Vietnam is a military dictatorship where opposition politicians and religious leaders are jailed and newspapers critical of the government are suppressed. Israel is a democracy with strong opposition parties and freedom of speech.

In Southeast Asia, the fighting was Vietnamese versus Vietnamese. Israel is the victim of attacks across recognized cease-fire lines by military forces of other nations and other peoples.

The South Vietnamese Government asked for U.S. troops from the beginning of their war and Americans did most of the heavy fighting there for a number of years. In four wars, Israel has never asked for American troops. It has proven it is willing and able to fight its own wars.

Our effort in the Middle East is limited to counterbalancing Soviet arms sent to the area. In Vietnam, the mistake was sending American troops, in addition to equipment, while the Soviets and the Chinese were supplying only equipment.

In Vietnam, American psychological warfare experts felt it was necessary to launch special campaigns to win "the hearts and minds" of the South Vietnamese people to the cause of their government. There is no such problem in Israel.

The United States spent years trying to force the South Vietnamese to sit down at the conference table with their adversaries. Additional months were spent quarreling over the shape of the table. For years Israel has been actively seeking to sit down and negotiate all differences with its adversaries.

It is no secret that South Vietnamese officials pocketed millions of dollars in U.S. economic aid. Aid to the Israelis has meant the draining of swamps, the building of factories and the resettling of refugees in desert areas which were barren for a thousand years.

There is one last reason why Americans know that Israel is different from Vietnam. They know a Vietnamese nation will survive regardless of the outcome of the war in Southeast Asia. If Israel loses its war, it would be the end of the Israeli nation.

ACTION ON THE GEOTHERMAL FRONT

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 24, 1973

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, 3 years ago Congress passed and the President signed the Geothermal Steam Act of 1970. This act authorized the Secretary of the Interior to identify and lease Federal lands with a known or potential geothermal promise. It was an important first step in the development of this resource.

Tuesday a second important step was taken in this regard: The Department of the Interior released a massive final environmental impact statement, as required by section 102(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act. The thrust of the impact statement is that the development of geothermal energy is not without some environmental consequences, but that these impacts are not intolerable and in some cases far less severe than those of competing energy sources.

I think it is important to note that the Department took a full 3 years to draw up implementation plans and to study the environmental ramifications involved in the exploratory development of this vital new resource. This was longer than I had thought it should take. But in a very real sense, this time-consuming yet necessary process shows us that the Department and the administration are firmly committed to the idea that we can, must, and will meet the energy demands of the years ahead with a balanced concern for the many environmental equities involved. The many departmental officials who took part in this effort deserve thanks and respect for their diligent efforts.

It is now time to proceed with a measured and considered program to develop what could eventually be a vital cornerstone of the energy sector. Geothermal energy offers much to those with the vision and wherewithal to grasp its implications.

FINEST EAGLE SCOUT IN THE
UNITED STATES

HON. JOHN E. HUNT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 24, 1973

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, John S. Jordan, 17, a resident of my congressional district, has been chosen as the best of the best by the National Activities Committee of the Boy Scouts of America in Chicago. John reached the finals by being judged the outstanding Explorer Eagle Scout in the Northeastern part of the country and Europe in mid-September.

I had the distinct pleasure of meeting this young man not too long ago when he visited a Masonic lodge. Contrary to what many think about the youth of today, John Jordan, I feel, typifies what is right with the youth of America and what is right about our great country. He is completely dedicated to his God, his family and his country.

Nothing could please me more than to take this opportunity to pay tribute to Eagle Scout John S. Jordan of Oaklyn, N.J.

I submit the enclosed article from the Courier-Post so that my colleagues might share his accomplishments.

The article follows:

SINGLED OUT AS FINEST EAGLE SCOUT IN UNITED STATES—OAKLYN YOUTH IS CHOSEN BEST OF THE BEST

(By Pete Finley)

In between serving as the current Boy's State governor of New Jersey, winning the outstanding biology student award at Collingswood High School, being elected to the National Honor Society, being the drum major of his high school band, playing first solo trombone for the dance band at the same school and lots of other things too numerous to mention, John Jordan has just been chosen THE Eagle Scout of the entire United States.

The 17-year-old high school senior was picked as the best of the best by the National Activities Committee of the Boy Scouts of America in Chicago earlier this week. He reached the finals by being judged the outstanding Explorer Eagle Scout in the Northeastern part of the country and Europe in mid-September.

LOCAL START

John and other finalists began the quest for the impossible dream by first winning the nod of their local activities committee which, in John's case, was the Camden County unit. According to John, almost all Eagle Scouts and Eagle Explorer Scouts were eligible which meant that literally thousands of candidates were in contention.

The finalists represented the best from six geographical areas of the country. There were 12 finalists, six Explorer Scouts and six Scouts.

In February the two winners will get the red carpet treatment which includes a Congressional breakfast on Capitol Hill in Washington, followed by a personal interview with President Richard M. Nixon.

John, who lives at 119 Woodland Terrace, Oaklyn, with his mother and maternal grandparents, hopes to study medicine "in some top university like Dartmouth." He wants to "serve his fellow man" and con-

siders the role of a physician "as a very special way to serve." "If I find that I don't like medicine, I'll enter some other form of social work," he said.

A member of Explorer Post 335 of the Camden County Council, John started as a Cub Scout at age eight, advancing to Scout which, he said, is geared to age groups from 11 to 15. At 15, he became an Explorer Scout, an activity which includes coeducational programs up to age 21.

John said the academic discipline and personal motivation which helped get him where he is "was due in a large measure to the many trying and demanding experiences of scouting which developed character and leadership qualities that might have lain dormant."

A member of the First United Methodist Church of Collingswood where he is song leader for Sunday School and youth organizer, John finds relaxation in music and swimming "in whatever spare moments I have."

He said he will remain in Scouting "probably for the rest of my life" in one capacity or another. The program has "too much to offer to others for me not to stay interested in it," he said.

BENNETT ACTS ON AGNEW GRAFT

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 24, 1973

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following: The recent disclosures surrounding the resignation of Vice President Agnew have led me to believe that legislation is very much needed which would require that all U.S. Government contracts for services and materials be awarded to the lowest qualified bidder. I have prepared such legislation, the wording of which is as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That all contracts by the United States Government for services and materials shall be awarded to the lowest qualified bidder, including contracts for architectural and engineering work. Further, that all contracts financed in whole or in part by Federal funds shall be awarded only to the lowest qualified bidder, including contracts for architectural and engineering work.

This legislation includes Government contracts for architectural and engineering work now passed out generously without bids to interested firms. The bill would also provide that all contracts financed in whole or in part by Federal funds would be awarded to the lowest qualified bidder.

The 40-page statement compiled against the former Vice President reveals in the State of Maryland what is apparently a longtime pattern there of political corruption through the noncompetitive awarding of contracts. I believe that Congress should do everything it can right now to see that this is no longer allowed on the Federal level.

I am currently seeking cosponsors for this legislation.

SPECIAL NIXON-COURT-CONGRESS
CRISIS QUESTIONNAIRE BEING
SENT TO CONSTITUENTS

HON. H. JOHN HEINZ III

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 24, 1973

Mr. HEINZ. Mr. Speaker, the events of the past week surrounding the Watergate investigation threaten government with a confrontation that may only be resolved by action in the Congress. Because I value the opinions of my constituents and want their advice, I am mailing the following questionnaire to each household in the 18th Congressional District of Pennsylvania.

My constituents are asked about their recent and prospective voting habits, how they view themselves politically, whether they feel the office of the President is above the law under any circumstances, and their opinion of impeachment proceedings against the President should he refuse a court order to turn over relevant tapes and documents regarding the Watergate.

Moreover, the poll attempts to gauge the level of trust people have in their elected public officials. It seems to me that restoring eroded confidence is of vital importance to all elected officials. I am hopeful this questionnaire will reveal the extent of the work ahead for all of us in public life.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that the full text of the questionnaire be printed at this point in the Record.

The text follows:

1. Did you vote in the 1972 Presidential election?
2. Would you vote if a national election were held right now?
3. Do you intend to vote in the 1974 General Election for a governor, U.S. Senator, and U.S. Representative?
4. What is your political registration? (Republican, Democrat, not registered, other)
5. Which of the following best describes your political views? (Check one)

Conservative
Moderate
Liberal

6. Do you feel that the office of the President is above the law under any circumstances?

7. With the abolition of the office of the Special Prosecutor, would you favor action by Congress to establish a Special Prosecutor's Office to pursue the Watergate grand jury investigation?

8. Which of the following best expresses your feelings about the President's actions to dismiss Special Watergate Prosecutor Cox and force the resignations of Attorney General Richardson and Deputy Attorney General Ruckelshaus? (Check one)

Strongly approve
Mostly approve
Mostly disapprove
Strongly disapprove
No opinion

9. How would you feel about impeachment proceedings if the President refuses to obey a court order to turn over Watergate tapes, telephone logs and other relevant documents?

Strongly favor
Mostly favor
Mostly opposed

Strongly opposed
No opinion
10. How would you describe your attitude toward elected public officials (Check one).
Trust all
Trust most
Trust some
Trust none

CHILD ABUSE AND NEGLECT

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 24, 1973

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, last week I introduced a new, compromise bill on child abuse and neglect, H.R. 10968. I think it is now pertinent to make clear in some detail the features of this compromise of the several bills, including my own, currently before the Select Education Subcommittee of the Education and Labor Committee.

The bill has three titles. Title I establishes a clearinghouse in the newly created Office of Human Development in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The purpose is to centralize information concerning the many and various efforts that are currently being made on the question of abuse and neglect. This is similar to my data bank proposal and the clearinghouse proposal of other bills; \$1 million annually is authorized for this title.

Title II is the crucial provision. It authorizes \$20 million annually to States which submit appropriate child abuse and neglect plans to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The rationale is that certain minimum facilities and procedures are necessary in the community if money spent is to be of any value.

I wish to emphasize the plan requirements in the bill represent minimum standards for State action, and are not meant to mandate a detailed blueprint for child services. The States are left free—as they should be—to write the details of their own programs on child abuse and neglect.

Specifically, the State plans must include an effectively enforced child abuse reporting law, mandatory reporting requirements, immunity from prosecution for reporting—should there be any difficulties with a mistaken report—and a provision for misdemeanor penalty for those who fail to report.

The State plan must also provide for prompt investigation of complaints of abuse and neglect, and contain minimum procedures for handling the broad problems of prevention and treatment. Additionally, it must provide for emergency custody of the child in appropriate cases.

Finally, the State agency is mandated to enter into cooperative arrangements with private, nonprofit groups to insure all the resources of the community are utilized.

Title III authorizes \$5 million annually for demonstration grants for research,

training, and innovative projects. This meets the special needs in this area not served by a State program, and assists the funding of existing private programs already doing useful work in these areas.

H.R. 10968 is a compromise between my previous bill, which relied exclusively on funding State agencies with State plans, and those bills concentrating on demonstration grants and further studies.

My bill adds demonstration programs to the State agency mechanism, but drops the study commission called for in the demonstration grant approach.

It is my conviction that existing studies and research programs cover the need in this area. Moreover, I am concerned that a bill which concentrates on further study—through the creation of a National Commission—will delay a commitment to a broad based program. We have sufficient information to proceed with the beginnings of such a program, while continuing to study the program through the mechanisms associated with both the State programs and the demonstration grants.

Finally, I have altered the definition of abuse to include neglect, a much larger and tougher problem in the long run. This area, touching on matters such as exploitation of the child, and severe detriments to his psychological health—is so closely related to the problem of abuse that I feel it should be treated as an integral part of the problem.

MININUKES AND DISESTABLISHMENT OF THE AIR FORCE AND OTHER THINGS

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 24, 1973

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, on Friday last, I spoke at a Navy dinner sponsored by the Armed Services Committee of the city of Long Beach. The remarks covered such subjects as resupply in the Mideast, the advisability of disestablishing the Department of the Air Force, possibilities for using small, clean, discrete nuclear weapons, called mininukes, and their implications to NATO and to the Navy, whose 198th birthday the occasion was celebrating, and other things. The text of these remarks follows:

U.S. NAVY BIRTHDAY, 1973

This evening we have gathered to celebrate the 198th birthday of the United States Navy—an institution described by Herman Wouk as a thing “conceived by geniuses for operation by idiots.”

But whatever its origin and whoever may have been its creator, the United States Navy stands today—in ships—in men—in tradition—in spirit—and in its unparalleled record of victories at sea—as indisputably the greatest Navy that history has ever known.

And, we rededicate ourselves to keeping it that way.

I am proud and grateful for my 33 years service as an enlisted man and officer in that Navy's Reserve Forces. I know each of you is

proud and grateful for your own particular association with this unparalleled organization.

In this audience tonight are many who have been shipmates with the great naval persons of our times such as: Chester Nimitz, Ed Spruance, Bull Halsey, Arleigh Burke, Jack McCain, Tom Moorer, Bud Zumwalt, Hyman Rickover and a host of others who—in hot war and cold—have protected their country with courage and brilliance.

And behind shining leaders such as these—and as it always has been from our Navy's beginning in 1775 to this very moment—active duty personnel, reservists, civilian employees, dependents and retirees have combined forces to forge a proud naval tradition of commitment and service to our Nation.

These people, and people like yourselves who support this Navy so loyally, constitute our naval family. This family, through nearly two centuries of peace and war, has continued to affirm the truth of President John Adams' words that “naval power is the natural defense of the United States.”

From sail to steam to nuclear power—from cutlass and cannon to guided missiles—from the open seas to outer space—the unfailing skill, selfless sacrifice and wholehearted devotion of the Navy family have remained ever constant to place and to maintain our Navy at its historic pinnacle of preeminence.

By this ceremony today we rededicate ourselves to maintaining this Navy's dominance of the world's oceans during the indefinite future. For, it is only by control of the seas that an island nation such as ours can, for long, control its own destiny.

This each of you knows as surely as you know that day follows the night. And, what each of you also suspects, is that it will be no easy task to keep control of the seas and maintain that preeminence of the United States Navy in the years ahead. That is the prospect as I see it, too. That is what I want to speak with you about this evening.

It is said that those who fail to remember the lessons of history are doomed to relearn them. In the recent period of relaxation of tensions between the world's two superpowers some people in very high places have already forgotten those lessons. Ignoring the ceaseless stream of battles and conflict that have characterized the relations of people and nations throughout history, the House of Representatives, within just the past few weeks, dealt a stunning blow to the defense of this nation by adopting the Aspin amendment imposing a blanket reduction in this year's defense authorization of almost a billion dollars. Then the United States Senate came within two votes of killing the TRIDENT submarine program which is so essential to the deterrence of a nuclear attack on this Nation. On vote-after-vote other measures were adopted, one-by-one, each dealing some further blow to the capability of the armed forces of the United States to defend the United States.

All this was done by those who quickly forgot the existence of an inexorable ebb and flow in hostility between nations which was only recently reaffirmed at an awful cost in American lives by the Vietnam War. To such naive legislators the Russians seem friendly; therefore they are friendly. Things are what they seem. That is the fallacy of *post hoc ergo propter hoc*, and any nation which embraces such a delusion must embrace it as a hari-kari knife.

An essay under my name in the August issue of U.S. Naval Institute Proceedings warns that no nation can fall for long below a certain minimum level of defense effort without arousing the instincts of predators. Fortunately some of the House and Sen-

ate blows to the Armed Services Authorization bill were eased because the outbreak of the renewed fighting in the Arab-Israeli war served to remind some of my Congressional colleagues of the existence of such predatory instincts.

But even so, the long range trend in this country is definitely anti-military and that means that those of us who do remember History's lessons are going to be hard pressed to garner appropriations from the Congress year-after-year which will support the minimum necessary national defense.

Even today, in real terms of constant value dollars, 1974 Defense Department resources will be almost 14% below those of 1964, that year being the last peacetime year before Vietnam. Our military investment in ships, research and construction will be almost a third lower in 1974 than it was 10 years ago in 1964. This means that this year the U.S. defense effort will be lower than during any year of the 1950's—a decade when things were relatively placid.

But the truth is that things generally around the world and things particularly between the United States and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics are just not that much better than they were then.

In my Naval Institute article I pointed out that the current detente between the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. and the Peoples Republic of China occurs not because we all suddenly love each other. Communist dogma decrees that all other systems must be destroyed; and that until they are, the world is not safe for communism; and that communist military power is the ultimate instrument by which the world is to be made safe for communism. Now, dogma does not say when all this is to be done or exactly how, and it warns against doing it in some reckless or adventurous way that risks ultimate defeat. Dogma also is a little unclear about many other things and the Soviets and the Chinese interpretations of them are quite at odds. In fact, they have fallen into a serious dialectical dispute with each other about it all.

And, even more relevant to the situation at hand, those two countries also have fallen into a much more basic kind of a dispute. Each is a growing, vital, expanding society. Each knows that achieving its ultimate destiny requires expansion into the vast Siberian heartland of Asia. Moreover, both know that, as enormous as the vacant real estate is, there is room enough there for just one of them, not for both of them. Thus they recognize and acknowledge themselves to be in a bitter conflict for ultimate survival.

Detente simply means that while those two are fighting their intramural Communist battle—which might well turn into a hot war, even employing nuclear weapons—the rest of us may be able to relax somewhat for a little while. But it certainly does not mean that we can pound our swords into plowshares. It does not even mean that the United States can assume that the P.R.C. and the U.S.S.R. will not call a truce in their own dispute if an opportunity arises whereby they can temporarily join forces to eliminate the United States as the next largest threat to either of them.

That is one reason why the current war in the mideast poses such dangers to us. I do not believe the Soviets at this point want that war to get out of hand. I believe they want to deal with their China problem first and for that reason they will try reasonably hard to keep alive the spirit of detente with the West.

But should the United States move too decisively in the mideast—move too far toward developing circumstances there inimical to the basic interests of the Soviet Union—then there is a possibility that Moscow can come to believe that its self-interest can only

be forwarded by a direct confrontation with the United States. I hope we are smart enough—and patient enough—to avoid precipitating that kind of a confrontation. I believe we are. I pray we are.

Despite the caution I have just expressed, I think the United States and Russia can get away with replenishing the material losses their respective client states are suffering as the fighting goes on. I believe that each will carefully look the other way as this is discreetly done. But neither had better try any augmentation—and they both know it.

But, there are other players in the mideast tragedy and therefore other dangers.

There are rumors that Israel has nuclear bombs and would use them as a last resort if pressed too hard.

There are rumors that Red China might clandestinely give a few nuclear weapons to either or both sides, hoping to trigger an escalation of warfare in the mideast which would envelope the superpowers in mushroom clouds that simultaneously consume both of China's superpower enemies.

In addition to these nuclear threats, there is the volatile, unpredictable psychology of the Arabs to consider. This might lead to an effort by them to pressure and distress the United States through denial of petroleum which we are coming to rely upon in ever increasing measure. Such a move would likely disturb Western Europe and Japan as much or more than the United States.

Nothing of what I have said in this recital of the perils and dangers our country faces in just one region of the world can be anything but deeply disturbing to each of us. I only ask that you try to visualize how much more hazardous the situation might become—and how much deeper in harm's way we might be—if today in the Mediterranean there were no United States Sixth Fleet.

Today's crisis is another vivid current history lesson pointing to the absolute indispensability of U.S. naval forces to the security of our nation.

Think about it—and then try to give me one good reason why we should allow those to succeed who want to scuttle the United States Navy in the name of economy, or under the banner of "social needs", or alleged "human priorities", or any other soft-headed slogan. This Navy is not only our life-line, it is basic to our national life itself.

Yet this is the Navy that is steadily being debilitated by reductions in dollar support from the Congress and by the steady erosion of the buying power of the dollars it does manage to lay hold of. A moment ago I mentioned that we are living through a bleak period of anti-militarism which is likely for the indefinite future to severely restrict the allocation of public resources to defense. Therefore we must examine ways by which the reduced number of dollars likely to be available can suffice to buy the bare minimum defense effort which experience in our hostile world tells us we cannot safely be without.

At this point I am going to take a brief stroll through the political minefields by examining two of those possible ways. One has to do with the Air Force and the other with nuclear weapons of a new type which are clean and discrete in their effects. A few months ago I coined for them the name "mininuks" and that is how they are known in the Pentagon, NATO and elsewhere.

First, as to the Air Force, born in 1947, during post-WWII enthusiasm for the wild blue yonder. Today, 26 years later, there exists a very legitimate question—and it is a hot one—whether reconsolidating airpower functions back into the Army and the Navy from whence they came might lead to considerably improved effectiveness in the expenditure of limited defense dollars. As it is we tend to think of the defense appropria-

tion as a pie to be sliced up annually in three roughly equal pieces. Yet the burden of defense necessities in the post Vietnam world do not fall equally at all. They fall heaviest on the Navy which must function worldwide, next on the Army, and last on the Air Force. I'm not going to delve any further into the subject of disestablishing the Air Force. I just light the fuse and toss it, realizing the thing is likely to be back in my face by the time it is ready to go off.

And, the same is probably true for the subject of mininuks to which I now proceed. Let me introduce it by recalling that the essence of military power is the ability to destroy, which we conventionally think of in terms of 100, 500, 1000, 5000 and 10,000 pound bombs and warheads. Paradoxically, if we possess such a capability for destruction of military forces and the ability to project it wherever and whenever it is needed, we are unlikely ever to use it, simply because others are deterred by this potential from challenging us.

Unfortunately, of late the cost of lugging that power around and projecting it when and where needed has escalated considerably and there is no end to this economic phenomenon in sight. If we are going to continue to adequately defend our interests and our independence with fewer dollars that buy less, then we are going to have to explore less costly ways of going about it.

I'll return to the Navy situation in a minute, but the thought I have in mind is most easily projected by reference to its application in a land war situation. Let's think for the moment of the defense of Europe by NATO forces from an invasion by Soviet forces, or, put another way, NATO's ability to deter such an invasion by maintaining an obvious capability to repel it. Now, think of a map of that area with a lot of red dots on the Soviet side of it representing tanks and soldiers and airplanes. Think of a lot of blue dots on our side of the map representing American and other NATO forces.

At this point, if you are thinking realistically, you are seeing a lot more of their red dots than you are seeing of our blue dots—and the disparity in numbers and strength is growing. One reason it is growing is that a Soviet tank costs maybe \$100,000, while the NATO tank we need to neutralize it costs maybe \$1,000,000. At those prices our side can soon get tilted out of the game. We need an equalizer. We need an equalizer which we can afford to buy in quantity and project against those tanks and destroy them if they come after us.

To accomplish that kind of destruction with 1000 pound bombs requires a lot of \$2 million airplanes operating from several \$200 million bases backed up by a \$200 million logistics supply train. In contrast, a clean and discriminate mininuk might pack the effect of 1000 pounds of TNT in less than a 100 pound package. This small, clean package of destruction might be accurately delivered at a rather modest cost by a relatively small piece of artillery or a guided rocket. Even on a tight budget one could afford to buy enough of this kind of blue dots to stand off a very large number of their kind of red dots.

Now let us return to the naval arena and test out what the potential is there for this anti-red dot mininuk thing.

As prices now stand, in capital costs alone, projecting naval destruction from a patrol frigate costs \$50 million per frigate and \$90 million per each new 963 Spruance class destroyer. From a 92,000 ton nuclear carrier the cost runs about a billion dollars for the ship and a half billion more for an air wing. The new 10,000-ton nuclear guided missile destroyers cost a quarter of a billion dollars each, without their missiles.

But for a 1,000-ton, 80-mile-an-hour surface effect ship, the cost is \$2½ million.

Yes, that's right—not \$50 or \$90 or \$250 or a thousand million dollars, but only \$2½

million for a ship that could carry enough light, mininuk-tipped guided rockets to equal the firepower of a modern DD. You could buy 36 of them for the cost of one single 963 class destroyer. The potentiality of this new and infinitely cheaper kind of naval hardware, if and when combined with the clean, sharp destructive potential of mini-weight mininuks, is truly startling. The combination offers an equalizer at a price we can afford to pay which can put us efficiently back into the business of controlling the seas and defending this country's vital national interests.

The barrier to utilizing it is simply the fact that mininuks bear the stigmatized nuclear name.

The truth is that, though based on nuclear principles, the nature and destructive power of this warhead will be much closer to that of gunpowder than it is to an atomic bomb. The general public must be brought to understand this so we can get over the anti-nuclear psychological hurdle that prevents mininuk additions to the defense arsenal of the United States. This roadblock constitutes a particularly severe handicap to development of the less costly naval hardware our Navy must have if it is to acquire the quantity of naval surface units required to assure freedom of the seas in the face of rapidly expanding hostile forces.

As indicated, the two propositions I have spoken of tonight are highly controversial—so controversial that neither of them has had the informed public discussion they deserve. I hope tonight may help serve to break the ice.

But whether it does so or not, I am confident that our unique naval heritage and the spirit of Navy Birthday 1973 which we have been privileged to share together this evening will continue to guide our Navy's growth in the year ahead as we rededicate ourselves with pride, professionalism and patriotism to the tasks that lie before us.

WEST VIRGINIA REHABILITATION ASSOCIATION CITES CONGRESSIONAL OVERSIGHT OF REHABILITATION LEGISLATION

HON. CARL D. PERKINS

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 24, 1973

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, on August 3, during an oversight hearing on the Rehabilitation Services Administration, conducted by the Select Subcommittee on Education, so ably chaired by our colleague from Indiana, Mr. BRADEMAs, it was revealed that a memorandum, written by William A. Morrill, Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, called for the dissolution of the highly successful, 53-year-old program of vocational rehabilitation.

Knowledge of the existence of this memorandum, Mr. Speaker, has led to strong and heated reaction throughout the country.

Evidence of that reaction is a resolution, unanimously approved by the West Virginia Rehabilitation Association during its annual meeting on September 5 which commends Congressman BRADEMAs and the Select Subcommittee on Education for their diligence in protecting handicapped Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I insert the resolution at this point in the RECORD:

WEST VIRGINIA REHABILITATION ASSOCIATION,
Charlestown, W. Va., September 10, 1973.
Hon. JOHN BRADEMAs,
Chairman, Select Education Subcommittee of the House Committee on Education and Labor, U.S. Congress, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BRADEMAs: Enclosed is a Resolution passed unanimously by the West Virginia Rehabilitation Association during its annual meeting on September 5, 1973, expressing strong support for you and members of the Select Education Subcommittee of the House Committee on Education and Labor in the oversight hearings on the State-Federal Vocational Rehabilitation program. The Association, made up of 1,020 members, recognizes your efforts to protect the Vocational Rehabilitation program against any moves to dismantle and destroy it.

I am sending copies of the Resolution to other members of the Subcommittee and to Congressmen from West Virginia.

Sincerely yours,

EDDIE MICKEL, President.

RESOLUTION

Whereas, Congressman John Brademas and the Select Education Subcommittee of the House Committee on Education and Labor conducted oversight hearings on the State-Federal Vocational Rehabilitation program; and

Whereas, Congressman Brademas and the Subcommittee were alert to a move by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to dismantle the Vocational Rehabilitation program; and

Whereas, Congressman Brademas and the Subcommittee took prompt and decisive action to protect the Vocational Rehabilitation program against any moves to destroy it: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the West Virginia Rehabilitation Association and its 1,020 members commend Congressman Brademas and the Subcommittee for their diligence, scrutiny, and concern in the oversight hearings toward protecting handicapped people against Administration moves to dismantle and destroy the program they so desperately need; and be it

Resolved further, That this resolution be sent to Congressman Brademas and each member of the Select Education Subcommittee of the House Committee on Education and Labor.

EDDIE MICKEL, President.

WE NEED A NEW MINIMUM WAGE BILL

HON. JOHN N. ERLBORN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 24, 1973

Mr. ERLBORN. Mr. Speaker, there are chairmen who watch things happen; chairmen who complain about what has happened; and chairmen who make things happen.

The chairman of our General Subcommittee on Labor (Mr. DENT) watched while the minimum-wage bill headed toward a veto. Then he complained when it was vetoed.

He can still rank among chairmen who make things happen by bringing a new minimum-wage bill to the floor. If he

tries hard enough, he could make the new year start right for millions of people.

THREE ARTICLES ON EVENTS OF RECENT DAYS

HON. DONALD W. RIEGLE, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 24, 1973

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. Speaker, three items appear in today's Washington Star-News that shed important light on events of recent days. One is a news story by James Polk; the other two are editorial page columns, one by James Reston, and the other by Charles Bartlett.

I include these three items for the interest of my colleagues:

[From the Washington Star-News, Oct. 24, 1973]

LETTER REVEALS MILK LOBBY OFFER

(By James Polk)

The milk lobby, while seeking White House favors, promised President Nixon \$2 million in campaign contributions in a letter written by a former Nixon aide and congressman.

Patrick J. Hillings of California, the former aide who had won Nixon's old seat in The House, sent the letter to the President telling him of the offer of campaign money from the milk lobby a few months before the Nixon administration raised price supports for the dairy industry.

The milk lobby eventually gave \$422,500 for the Nixon campaign, starting the week of the price increase.

Hillings, then a Washington attorney for the milk lobby, wrote to Nixon on Dec. 16, 1970, asking the President to approve import quotas on ice cream and other dairy products. Nixon granted them.

The Hillings letter, now in the possession of the Senate Watergate committee, is considered a major piece of evidence in the probe of the controversial Nixon dairy donations.

The letter is the first indication that Nixon personally knew about the forthcoming flow of money from the milk lobby while the favorable decisions were being granted to the dairy industry.

Witnesses from both the campaign organization and the milk lobby had testified previously in a federal court case that no money had been promised before the prices were raised.

Records show the campaign checks started arriving in March 1971 during the same week that the Nixon administration reversed itself and increased price supports in a move estimated to be worth \$700 million to the dairy industry.

Two days before that turnabout, Nixon had met with dairymen in the Cabinet Room as they asked for the price intervention. According to testimony, the farm leaders gathered with Hillings in his nearby law offices before walking over to that White House meeting.

The three major milk groups in the Midwest, including the giant Associated Milk Producers, Inc. (AMPI), based in Texas, were clients of Hillings' law firm.

Hillings opened his December 1970 letter to Nixon on quotas by saying "This letter discusses a matter of some delicacy . . ."

Then, before making his argument for import protection, Hillings mentioned that the milk lobby had made about \$135,000 in campaign contributions to GOP candidates in the 1970 Senate and House elections. He added:

"We are now working with Tom Evans and Herb Kalmbach in setting up appropriate channels for AMPI to contribute \$2 million for your re-election. AMPI also is funding a special project."

Herbert W. Kalmbach, the President's personal attorney in Los Angeles, and Thomas W. Evans, a former Nixon law partner in New York, were key fund-raising officials for the 1972 campaign.

The "special project" mentioned by Hillings remains a mystery. The milk lobby did furnish a \$5,000 campaign check in September 1971 that was used to pay the costs of the White House plumbers' break-in in the Daniel Ellsberg case, but there is nothing to tie that with Hillings' 1970 letter.

Hillings was urging the President to approve import quotas on dairy products already recommended by the U.S. Tariff Commission. Nixon put them into effect on Dec. 31, 1970.

Hillings' association with Nixon goes back a quarter-century, to when he was an assistant to Nixon as a congressman. When Nixon won a Senate seat in 1950, Hillings was elected to succeed him in the House district east of Los Angeles. He served four terms.

As a Washington lawyer, Hillings practiced in the same firm that another longtime Nixon loyalist, Murray Chotiner, joined upon leaving the White House in March 1971, two weeks before the milk price increase.

Chotiner has testified he went back to talk with his White House colleagues that month and warned them, "If you don't help the farmer, you don't get his support." But he said he was referring to votes, not money.

Consumer advocate Ralph Nader has charged the price boost was a favor granted in return for the campaign donations and has sued in federal court to have the increase rolled back. Chotiner and other witnesses have denied Nader's allegation in the suit, which is still pending.

Hillings, now 50, returned to California in 1970. He could not be reached last night for comment.

Copies of both the Hillings letter and a White House memo in 1972 that cited the \$2 million commitment have been obtained by the Star-News.

Even though the contribution promise was never completely fulfilled, the milk lobby did become one of the five largest donors for the Nixon campaign last year.

Most of its money was contributed in a \$327,500 outpouring in 1971, made through several dummy committees in Washington. But after news stories uncovered the milk money and coupled it to the price increase, the contributions stopped. The final \$95,000 did not come until the last weeks before the 1972 election.

Only a few days after the Nader suit was filed, former White House aide Gordon R. Strachan told Nixon chief-of-staff H. R. Haldeman in a Feb. 1, 1972, memo that Kalmbach was "very concerned."

Strachan noted Kalmbach might be subpoenaed and suggested that he not be used any more "in the milk project because of the risk of disclosure." Haldeman replied he would discuss the problem with then Atty. Gen. John N. Mitchell.

That memo mentions an aide to former Treasury Secretary John Connally.

The aide, Jake Jacobsen, was mentioned as one of two men handling the milk pledge. Strachan quoted Kalmbach as predicting that Jacobsen and the other person "will deliver, though they have cut the original 2,000 commitment back to 1,000."

In political shorthand the figures referred to \$2 million and \$1 million. But the tap on the milk money was actually closed a few days later.

Testimony in the Nader suit shows Kalm-

bach met in February 1972 with the new head of AMPI and when that official said all further donations would be made on public record, Kalmbach informed him a short time later that he was "terminating" his request for AMPI money.

THE TAPES BUY TIME (James Reston)

The one thing you have to say for Richard Nixon is that he knows when he is licked. Almost everything he always said he would never do—compromise with Moscow, recognize Peking, accept deficit financing, or be unfaithful to his promises—he has done. And he has done it again by releasing the Watergate tapes, which he said he would never release.

It was a clever move. He has retreated from one mess to another, but he has gained time. It will take weeks to get the tapes down on paper and to get a new team to take over the prosecution at the Justice Department, but meanwhile, he has gotten rid of Archibald Cox, the "independent" prosecutor, which was probably his objective, and he has postponed—though he has not avoided—a critical battle with both the courts and the Congress.

The President, was in terrible trouble before he switched and agreed to let the tapes go to the courts. He judged Archibald Cox well enough. He gave Cox a dishonorable order he knew Cox wouldn't accept, and he was right.

But the President misjudged Atty. Gen. Richardson, and Deputy Atty. Gen. Ruckelshaus. He appealed to Richardson to concentrate on the Middle East crisis, and stay on even if Cox disappeared.

The White House didn't even give Richardson time to respond to the President's order to fire Cox. Gen. Alexander Haig called Richardson at 7 o'clock last Saturday night and told him the President was sending him a message, which seemed to call for an answer from Richardson, but while the attorney general was trying to draft a reply, the White House put out its announcement that Cox was fired.

Then the White House turned to Ruckelshaus to fire Cox, and Haig not only told him this was an order from "the commander in chief" but appealed to him on patriotic grounds to carry out the order. Ruckelshaus, according to his associates, replied that patriotism was not the same as obedience, that in his mind it was sometimes the opposite, and that he would not comply. So he was fired.

Meanwhile, Richardson appealed to the President's aides and lawyers to consider what the reaction would be in Congress and in the country if they fired Cox for carrying out the independent prosecution he was promised by the President and the attorney general, but his appeals were rejected.

It is interesting and significant that during those critical five days when Richardson was negotiating with the White House staff, and warning them not to fire Cox or force his own resignation, the President never discussed the problem personally with his own attorney general, until the very end when it was clear that the President was determined to get rid of Cox. Only then, when Richardson said he would resign if Cox was fired, did the President agree to see him.

It was a typical, bold, and desperate Nixon play, but this time it didn't work. Public reaction went against the President.

Accordingly, the President was confronted with precisely the power struggle he had sought to avoid. The Congress was proceeding toward impeachment proceedings in the House. The unions were demanding his dismissal from the presidency. More important,

the old Republican establishment, led by the leaders of the bar, was denouncing the dismissal of Cox and the resignation of Richardson.

Facing all this, and the prospect that the controversy would go back into the streets if he defied the courts and the Congress, the President agreed to hand over the tapes. This will avoid the clash for a time but not for long.

For once he has admitted the tapes to evidence in the courts, it will be hard for him to exclude other relevant documents, or to argue against another special prosecutor. He is rid of Cox for the moment, but not of prosecution. He has saved his skin, but not his honor.

Ironically, he chose to challenge in this latest of his political crises three men—Cox, Richardson and Ruckelshaus—who had become the most attractive and articulate symbols of objectivity and probity in his administration. And in the process, he lost all three.

This has shocked Washington more than anything since the Watergate burglary, and while he now has time to try to sort things out, he has affronted his own most loyal supporters and even his own Cabinet, and raised the most serious questions about his moral authority to govern over the next three years.

THE AX THAT FELL ON COX (Charles Bartlett)

With yesterday's release to Judge Sirica of the Watergate tapes, the dust has settled enough to discover that President Nixon fired Archibald Cox because he ran out of tolerance for a pack of Ivy League lawyers who seemed bent on running him to the ground.

On May 22 the President described Cox as a symbol of his determination "to see the truth brought out." However, by late summer he became convinced, mainly by the anguish of ex-associates who were being investigated, that the special prosecutor posed a running affront to the presidency. Cox would have been fired earlier if the President had not needed to wait out the Spiro Agnew drama.

Temperament more than tactics seems to have forced the denouncement. Cox was viewed with emotion from the White House as a swollen-headed professor propelled by partisan malice into an anti-Nixon crusade. While wholly at odds with this observer's, the White House view gained substance from the "highly motivated" demeanor of some of the young lawyers he recruited.

Two factors make it appear that the President did not force the hounds out of the hunt because they were getting close to his heels. First, according to an objective source who should know, Cox's sleuths have not acquired evidence that involves Nixon in criminal activities. Second, the elimination of Cox makes it almost certain that another special prosecutor, named by Congress or the grand jury, will take up the inquiry, perhaps at an even hotter pace.

The negotiations over the tapes were carried on last week against the growing awareness of insiders that Nixon meant to dump Cox at his earliest opportunity. His use of the tapes issue was a tricky, clever gambit. It is obvious that he could have sought acceptance of his compromise from the Court of Appeals without disturbing his arrangement with the special prosecutor.

The gambit fooled the three senators—John Stennis, Sam Ervin and Howard Baker—who were apparently not told that they were being offered no more or less access to the tapes than the grand jury was to have. They gratefully took what they

were offered without realizing that they had undermined the special prosecutor. If members of Congress had been quicker to grasp what was going on, they might have saved Cox with their protests.

The President will pay a high price for relief from his antipathy towards Cox. In losing Elliot Richardson and William French Smith, he draws further upon his dwindling reservoir of trust. Richardson was the honest broker, the public-interest mediator between the President's narrow concept of the Cox mandate and the wide horizons of the Watergate scandal. Nixon is now without a broker, even without an attorney general.

He has nettled his skeptics once again with a show of arrogant disregard for an earlier commitment. He added chill to the drama by deploying the FBI in a Gestapo-type flourish on Saturday night. With the surrender of the tapes, he is no closer to losing his office than he was before, but he has pulled further away from the hearts of his countrymen.

Nixon has virtually insured that the onus of Watergate prosecutions will no longer be left to the control of his administration. He has provoked a vacuum which Congress or the grand jury will fill. He can at least take one comfort—his next tormentor will probably not be Archibald Cox, a man too modest to be drawn by fate into a serialized contention with the President.

NATIONAL SECURITY—NO. 1 PRIORITY

HON. C. W. BILL YOUNG

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 24, 1973

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Armed Services Committee I have long been concerned over the state of our national security and military readiness, especially in view of the readiness of some groups to slash deeply into our military budget without regard for consequences.

Therefore, I was especially pleased to learn that the 1973 National Convention of the Military Order of the World Wars set the tone of its deliberations by declaring without equivocation that our national security must be accorded priority above all other programs. Following is the text of the first day resolution which sets forth the position that we should fund and implement without delay those military programs necessary to maintain our preeminent military posture in the world.

The resolution follows:

NATIONAL SECURITY—NO. 1 PRIORITY

Whereas, military strength second to none and the will to use it in defense of our national interests is the surest path to peace; and

Whereas, our national posture in current and projected negotiations for military detente and arms control is vitally dependent upon our present and projected military strength; and

Whereas, serious efforts are being made to erode this goal which at this time has been projected to a twenty year low; and

Whereas, other national programs can flourish only when our national security is assured.

Therefore be it resolved, that The Military Order of the World Wars in National Convention assembled, affirms that national security should have first priority among all national programs and calls upon the Congress to expand, as necessary, the military funding needed to continue our country as a first rate power in the world.

MRS. HELEN "CHILDS" BOYDEN

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 24, 1973

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I come with a profound sadness in my heart today to inform my colleagues of the death of a fine and gentle woman, Mrs. Helen "Childs" Boyden, wife of the late, renowned headmaster of Deerfield Academy in Deerfield, Mass., Frank L. Boyden.

Lest you think Helen Boyden will be remembered only as the wife of a great man, I would point out that this woman stood in no man's shadow. She was helpmate, soulmate, companion, and colleague to the headmaster. Her dedicated work at Deerfield Academy as an accomplished teacher of mathematics and science complemented that of her husband.

A native of Deerfield and a graduate of Smith College, Helen Childs came home to Deerfield Academy as a science teacher in 1905. Headmaster Boyden warned her then:

If you ever have any trouble with the boys, remember that I'll be on their side.

From the beginning, she was on the boys' side, too.

In 1907, the headmaster and Helen Childs were married. Years later, the headmaster was to write this tribute to his wife:

She is much more important than I am. She has a wonderful sense of humor and deep affection for the boys. She has more influence on the boys than I have. She makes them want to do the work. Her judgment is excellent. It is interesting that a combination such as the two of us could get together. She could have been the head of any school.

It would be hard to imagine a woman more respected by more people. She was held in high regard by the academic community and was awarded honorary degrees by a number of institutions including her own alma mater, Smith College; St. Lawrence University; Trinity College; and Mount Holyoke College. She left an indelible impression on her students and her passing will be noted with sorrow by all of them, many of whom have labored in this Chamber.

I was privileged to call Helen Boyden my good friend. Although she was buried on Monday, her memory, like that of her husband, will live on in the hearts of all of those who have been members of the Deerfield "family" throughout the years. At this time, I would like to ask my colleagues to join me and my wife, Corinne, in expressing our deepest sym-

pathy to her children John, Theodore, and Elizabeth, and her grandchildren.

SANTA ANA RIVER FLOOD CONTROL HELP REQUESTED

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 24, 1973

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, a serious and threatening condition exists in Orange County, Calif., with respect to the flood potential of the Santa Ana River. A large number of my constituents in California's 32d Congressional District could be adversely affected. The nature and extent of the problem as well as the key to its solution is contained in my letter of October 17 to Gov. Ronald Reagan requesting his help and the help of California's Legislature in establishing a unified flood control authority for both upper and lower reaches of this river. The letter follows:

OCTOBER 17, 1973.

Re Santa Ana River Basin flood control problem.

DEAR GOVERNOR REAGAN: For some months I have been seeking a solution to the multi-billion dollar flood threat posed in Orange County by the Santa Ana River. If this river ever goes out of control, thousands of my constituents in California's 32nd Congressional District as well as many other citizens of the County would be disastrously affected.

This letter requests your help and that of the California Legislature to forestall such a tragedy.

Various data and reports on the problem originated by the Los Angeles District of the U.S. Corps of Engineers reveal that in Orange County what is known for planning purposes by the Engineers as a Standard Project Flood could result in over \$2 billion in damages to homes, businesses, industries, transportation, local governments, other entities and from work lost.

I have an overlay map indicating that such a flood could inundate as many as 100,000 acres of Orange County, including part or all of the communities of Fountain Valley, Huntington Beach, Seal Beach, Surfside, Sunset Beach, Costa Mesa, Los Alamitos, Garden Grove, Westminster, Santa Ana, Tustin, Midway City, Orange, Anaheim, Cypress, Stanton, La Palma, Buena Park, Fullerton and Yorba Linda.

Even what is known as a 100-year flood (one which records suggest could occur about once a century) could cause an estimated half-a-billion dollars in damages in Orange County's coastal plain, with depths of water rising up to 7 feet over 35,000 acres of homes, businesses and public properties.

The Engineers have devised several alternate plans for the control of these and lesser floods of the Santa Ana River which, with its tributaries, runs through Orange, Riverside and San Bernardino Counties. They have calculated their costs to range from about \$300 million to some \$450 million. Orange and San Bernardino Counties have passed resolutions supporting Alternate Plan #6. Riverside County appears to favor something like #6. This degree of consensus among the counties appears to be based less on the merits of Alternate Plan #6 as an effective flood control instrumentality than it does a belief that this plan is the one least offensive to Riverside and San Bernardino interests.

Alternate Plan #6 contemplates a very large dam in the Mentone area which would be located astride the San Andreas Fault. A board of experts is being convened by the U.S. Corps of Engineers to evaluate the wisdom of such a location. It will probably take some time to act and I gather that extensive drilling and other geologic work would have to follow before any final technical decision could be expected. If it is negative, things must start from scratch again. Meanwhile, the clock ticks toward the inevitable time when actual flood conditions could materialize.

The root of our difficulty in coming up with a really effective plan to protect Orange County citizens from flooding lies in the disparity between physical benefits and financial burdens any plan will impose among the three affected counties. Although a major fraction of the costs of any of the various alternative flood control plans suggested would be borne by the Federal government, depending on the alternative selected, direct local costs could range from a few million dollars in the case of some alternatives to many millions in the case of others. Additionally, numerous indirect local costs, such as removing land from the tax rolls, relocating homes, farms and industries and the like, will result from any flood control project.

Whereas most of the beneficiaries of flood control will be Orange County taxpayers it can be assumed that most of the local costs will fall primarily on taxpayers living at the River's upper reaches in Riverside and San Bernardino counties where most of the actual flood control works would be located. This is partly because there are different flood control districts for each county, each with its separate financial structure. Upstream areas hardly can be expected to jump with joy at the prospect of assuming substantial costs which benefit them less than others. Nor, can they be expected to embrace an alternative which provides the most technically effective flood control but at a far higher price to them than some cheap but less adequate alternative.

I respectfully suggest to you, and by copy of this letter to the state legislators and county governments of the affected area, that for the purpose of overall Santa Ana River Basin flood control the existing control districts of each of the counties be consolidated by law into one unity with the power, insofar as possible, to allocate the direct and indirect local costs of flood control in the Basin up and down the River in some reasonable relationship to local benefits. Or, if there are more simple ways to achieve the same end, that they be adopted quickly so that we can get on with the necessary flood control construction in a timely fashion, in a fair fashion, and in an adequate fashion.

My point is, that if this situation is to be met, if disastrous flooding sometime in the near or intermediate future is to be avoided, then responsible officials of the State of California must initiate the required measures for speeding the achievement of a local consensus on a safe and adequate project. Until this is done, progress is stymied because the Federal government cannot, will not and should not attempt to impose its will in this local matter upon local people and local interests.

Some reasonable agreement among them is an absolute condition precedent to getting on with further major flood control work in the Santa Ana River Basin.

It is impossible for the U.S. Corps of Engineers to ask Congress for Federal millions for any project unless and until there is general agreement along the River on a carefully planned and technically sound project. As soon as, but not until, that is done, I and others of California's delegation in the Congress can bear our weight in Washington to enact the necessary major Federal appropriations.

Obviously, even if the help I ask you for is swift to come, the inherent delay in organizing and funding a project of the magnitude involved, and the lead time required for building it, will aggregate a period of several years. Thus, even if all goes smoothly, the odds for the occurrence in Orange County of a 100-year flood sometime during the next 10 years are 1 in 10. The odds for the occurrence of the larger and more devastating Standard Project Flood are 1 in 20 or 30. Consequently, the prospects are far from negligible that the Santa Ana River Basin will experience serious flooding before a project can be completed to protect it.

For that reason I strongly urge homeowners and businessmen in the area to avail themselves of Federally subsidized flood insurance available through regular brokers. Presently, the limits on this insurance are \$17,500 for a house, \$5,000 for its contents and \$30,000 for commercial buildings. Legislation which has passed the House of Representatives and is pending in the Senate will raise these limits to \$35,000, \$10,000 and \$100,000, respectively.

The potential value of this insurance in relation to the flood risks present in the communities listed earlier in this letter should not be lightly regarded. Pending completion of an adequate Santa Ana River Basin Flood Control Project, I hope that public officials of the affected area will join me in publicizing the availability of this insurance to residents and property owners in the Basin.

I also believe that cities, counties and flood control districts in the area should explore the feasibility of obtaining blanket flood control insurance for all interests within their political boundaries, and financing the premiums by a special local flood control tax to be enacted for that specific purpose.

Thank you and the other responsible officials for all you will do to straighten this matter out.

Sincerely,

CRAIG HOSMER,
Member of Congress.

"MURDER BY HANDGUN: THE CASE FOR GUN CONTROL"—NO. 37

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 24, 1973

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, today I am inserting an article on a murder-suicide that has destroyed the lives of a husband and wife.

Gun control legislation is the only way to help stop these "easy" killings.

The Washington Post article from October 16 is included below:

MURDER-SUICIDE RULING IN DEATHS

A D.C. medical examiner ruled yesterday that the shooting death of a 26-year-old man and his 25-year-old wife in Anacostia Sunday night were murder and suicide.

Deputy Medical Examiner Dr. William J. Brownlee said Steven Michael Greene, of Oakland, Calif., had apparently killed his estranged wife, Carolyn Hill Greene, 3035 Massachusetts Ave. SE, in a wooded area near her home here, and then taken his own life by shooting himself in the head.

Police said they believed Greene had arrived here from Oakland sometime Saturday. But they said they did not know when he met his wife, who has been working here as a secretary.

Charles Crocker, who has been living in the red brick apartment building where Mrs. Greene had been living, said the woman arrived in the District one or two months ago.

He said he did not know her and had only seen her in passing.

Neither police nor any neighbors could give any reason for the incident.

The bodies were found about 9 p.m. Saturday near the bottom of a hill at Minnesota and Anacostia Avenues, SE, about two blocks from the woman's home.

WELFARE MYTHS

HON. WILLIAM LEHMAN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 24, 1973

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, there has been a great deal of misunderstanding about our welfare system. The picture of hundreds of thousands of free-loading welfare cheaters getting rich off the American taxpayer is pure myth.

While there are certain areas of the system which need correction, the facts show that welfare goes largely to those groups in our Nation which are unable to help themselves—the aged, blind, disabled, children, and mothers who must stay home to care for young children.

Ann Landers has recently printed a letter from a youngster whose family was forced by tragedy to go on welfare. The letter seeks to dispel some of the more popular welfare myths.

The letter follows:

DEAR ANN: I am 15 years old. Dad died four years ago of cancer. There are five children in the family younger than I. My dad didn't belong to a union, he was self-employed, had no social security, and his insurance just barely covered his medical bills. Three years ago Mom had to go on welfare.

When we buy groceries with stamps some folks in the store look at us as if we are taking money out of their pockets. Sure, people on welfare cost taxpayers money, but Dad paid his taxes when he was alive and Mom can't feed us kids on what she makes working in a bakery.

I read some facts about welfare in an article put out by the Committee on Political Education. Every American should see it. You run the biggest billboard in America, Ann. Please print them.

Fact No. 1: People wind up on welfare not because they are cheats or loafers but because they are poor. They are poor not only in money, but in everything. They have had poor education, poor health care, a poor chance at decent employment and poor prospects for anything better.

Fact No. 2: Of the 15 million people on welfare, two million are aged, permanently disabled or blind. Three million are mothers.

Fact No. 3: Nobody is getting rich on welfare. At best, it allows barebone living. Maximum payment for a family of four ranges from \$700 a year in Mississippi to \$3,600 in New York, New Jersey, Massachusetts and Connecticut.

Fact No. 4: Cheating on welfare is not rampant, but minimal. No program involving 15 million people can be completely free of fakers. Probably less lying and cheating goes on in the Welfare Department than in the Internal Revenue Department.

Fact No. 5: Welfare mothers are not having babies just to collect extra money. Nearly 70 per cent of all children on welfare are legitimate, according to HEW.

Fact No. 6: The welfare rolls are not made up mostly of blacks. More than 48 per cent of the welfare families are white, 43 per

cent are black, the remaining are Orientals, American Indians and other ethnic groups. I hope this will help to reduce the bigotry and clear up some misunderstanding.

—You Might Be Next
Thank you for helping educate millions of people today. I checked your facts with the Department of Health, Education and Welfare and they are correct.

U.S.A. IS NOT SO BAD, A CANADIAN REPORTS

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 24, 1973

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, with so many bad things being said about our country these days, it is refreshing to have some contrary viewpoints, particularly from a friendly Canadian named Gordon Sinclair. His remarks, which should be read by everyone, are contained in an editorial which appeared in the October 8 issue of the San Antonio Light, which follows:

GOOD NEIGHBORS

Gordon Sinclair, a Canadian commentator and author of several books, wrote the following article several weeks ago. We reprint it from the Anchorage Daily Times as a refreshing view at a time when Canadian-American relations are somewhat strained—partly, to be sure, because of controversies involving the trans-Alaska pipeline project. The article is as follows:

"The United States dollar took another pounding on German, French and British exchanges . . . It has declined there by 41 per cent since 1971, and this Canadian thinks it is time to speak up for the Americans as the most-generous and possibly the least-appreciated people in all the Earth.

"As long as 60 years ago, when I first started to read newspapers, I read of floods on the Yellow River and the Yangtze. Who rushed in with men and money to help? The Americans did.

"They have helped control floods on the Nile, the Amazon, the Ganges and the Niger.

"As the rich bottomland of the Mississippi is under water, no foreign land has sent a dollar to help.

"Germany, Japan and, to a lesser extent, Britain and Italy, were lifted out of the debris of war by the Americans, who poured in billions of dollars and forgave other billions of debts.

"None of those countries is today paying even the interest on its remaining debts to the United States.

"When the franc was in danger of collapsing in 1956, it was the Americans who propped it up and their reward was to be insulted and swindled on the streets of Paris.

"I was there; I saw it.

"When distant cities are hit by earthquake, it is the United States that hurries in to help . . . Managua, Nicaragua, is one of the most-recent examples. This year, 59 American communities have been flattened by tornadoes. Nobody has helped.

"The Marshall Plan, the Truman policy, all pumped billions upon billions of dollars into discouraged countries. Now newspapers in those countries are writing about the decadent, warmongering Americans.

"I'd like to see just one of those countries that is gloating over the erosion of the United States dollar build its own airplanes.

"Come on, let's hear it!

"Does any other country in the world have a plane to equal the Boeing jumbo jet, the Lockheed Tristar or the Douglas 10? If so,

why don't they fly them? Why do all international lines except Russia fly American planes?

"Why does no other land on Earth even consider putting a man or woman on the Moon?

"You talk about Japanese technocracy and get radios. You talk about German technocracy and you get automobiles. You talk about American technocracy and you find men on the Moon, not once, but several times . . . and safely home again.

"You talk about scandals and the Americans put theirs right in the store window for everybody to look at.

"Even their draft dodgers are not pursued and hounded. They are here on our streets. Most of them . . . unless they are breaking Canadian laws, are getting American dollars from Ma and Pa at home to spend here.

"When the Americans get out of this bind . . . as they will . . . who could blame them if they said 'the hell with the rest of the world. Let someone else buy the Israel bonds. Let someone else build or repair foreign dams or design foreign buildings that won't shake apart in earthquakes.'

"When the railways of France, Germany and India were breaking down through age, it was the Americans who rebuilt them. When the Pennsylvania Railroad and the New York Central went broke, nobody loaned them an old caboose. Both are still broke.

"I can name you 5,000 times when the Americans raced to the help of other people in trouble.

"Can you name me even one time when someone else raced to the Americans in trouble?

"Our neighbors have faced it alone and I'm one Canadian who is tired of hearing them kicked around. They will come out of this thing with their flag high. And when they do, they are entitled to thumb their noses at the lands that are gloating over their present troubles.

"But there are many smug, self-righteous Canadians.

"And finally, the American Red Cross was told at its 48th annual meeting in New Orleans that it was broke. This year's disasters . . . with the year half over . . . had taken it all and nobody has helped."

WHY IS NACOA MEETING IN A CLOSET?

HON. DAVID R. OBEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 24, 1973

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, the public meeting of the National Advisory Committee on Oceans and Atmosphere this Friday and Saturday is to be held in room 6802 of the U.S. Department of Commerce Building, and NACOA has announced that the public will be admitted "to the extent of the very limited seating available on a first-come-first-served basis."

Now, a completely public meeting of NACOA is something of a novelty, so no one knows how many people will turn out to witness the proceedings. I am curious, however, why this advisory committee of 25 members will be meeting in dinky room 6802—which is little more than a closet—when the Commerce Department auditorium is available, at least for the Saturday session.

I cannot help thinking that NACOA, which has large-scale responsibilities, prefers a small-scale audience.

UNITED NATIONS WEEK

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 24, 1973

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, United Nations Week is an appropriate time to take a good look at that international organization. It has been popular to refer to its as "man's best hope" for so long that we rarely take a good hard look at the work of that body. Is it really man's best hope for peace. In all honesty, I answer "no." Man's best hope for peace, I am certain, still rests in a strong and vital United States of America. Despite the hopes and aspirations of founders, the U.N. gives little indication it will be able to cope with serious international problems.

It was founded in the hope that the victorious allies in World War II would continue their "commitment" to peace. However, even then the Communists were not committed to peace and 28 years later are even less committed. If the past 28 years have shown anything, it is that it is difficult if not impossible to have general rules of behavior acceptable to Communist and free states. By their very nature, Communist states utilize an entirely different rule. If the U.N. were limited to nations which have open and free societies, it could come closer to achieving its purpose.

Having followed the United Nations closely through the years, I can safely make two categorical statements: First, the United Nations should in no way be given any of our basic American sovereignty nor should we trust its decisions for important peacekeeping operations. Second, none of its actions should be implemented in any way or form in this country without a specific vote of Congress. There are too many inconsistencies and errors in its operation.

A case in point is a recent resolution adopted by the Committee on Colonialism regarding the status of Puerto Rico. By a vote of 12 to 2, the U.N. committee affirmed Puerto Rico's right to independence. The resolution requests that the United States "refrain from taking any measures which might obstruct the full and free exercise by the people of Puerto Rico of their inalienable right to self-determination and independence." It also keeps the Puerto Rican question under the Colonialism Committee's "continuous review."

John Scali, our Ambassador to the United Nations, has rightfully labeled this resolution "ludicrous." In a free and open election held last year, 51 percent of the Puerto Rican people voted for the Popular Democratic Party, a party which advocates maintenance of the current commonwealth status. Another 43 percent voted for the New Progressive Party, which is pressing for statehood in the United States. Only 5 percent of the electorate cast ballots in favor of the Independence Party.

The Committee on Colonialism is, therefore, pushing a plan that has been rejected by 95 percent of the voters. Perhaps, as Mr. Scali indicates:

It may be some consolation to the people of Puerto Rico, who undoubtedly will be as outraged as I am by this blatant interference in their internal affairs, to realize that many of the nations which took the lead in supporting the resolution do not permit their citizens freely to express their views on who will govern them and for how long.

If Americans watched the day-to-day actions and votes in the U.N., they would not be calling it man's best hope for peace. In my observations, it is interesting that the loudest critics of the United States here at home are more often than not the same ones who want some basic American sovereignty transferred to the U.N.

"MR. BUCK" OUTSTANDING AS COMMUNITY LEADER

HON. BILL ALEXANDER

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 24, 1973

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, since coming to Congress, I have dedicated a large portion of my energies and time to legislation and programs designed to assist the development of nonmetropolitan communities. However, programs and legislation do little good if the citizens themselves are not interested and concerned over the future of their cities.

I would like to share with my colleagues an article on one man from my hometown who has contributed greatly to the development of Osceola. Mr. J. C. Buchanan has exhibited endless energy in working with the civic organizations and the people of Osceola to improve and expand the economy and general welfare of the people who live there. Knowing such men gives me continued enthusiasm for the future of nonmetropolitan America and our Nation:

"MR. BUCK" OUTSTANDING AS COMMUNITY LEADER

(By Phil Mullen)

Since 1946, J. C. Buchanan has contributed as much or more to the expansion of the local economy, and to the general welfare of the community, as any other citizen.

"Mr. Buck" has received recognition in these columns before but what has made this writer think of him lately has been his great good sense about other people and his relationship with them.

He is a master salesman but he goes further than that. For instance, he has never been chincy in delegating authority to his son-in-law, Dewey Neely, who is vice president of the firm and then he gets along so very well with all of his help, because of his sincere interest in their personal welfare and he has a very low turnover of personnel at Buchanan Chevrolet & Olds.

One salesman came back a couple of years ago from 20 years of service in the Air Force and said that he had planned all of those years to "come back one day and sell cars for Buck."

He was one of the organizers of the Osceola Chamber of Commerce in 1947 and served on the board of directors almost continuously until about three years ago when he said, "It's time for a younger man to take over." More demonstration of good sense.

Mr. Buchanan is one of the four local leaders given most of the credit for the record industrialization of this small city. When the Chamber of Commerce was organized, those

36 years ago, members dug down in their pockets and put up their own money to encourage more housing and to afford more job opportunities for the community.

The other three who engaged in that long drive for industry were late Mayor Ben F. Butler, Faber White and Harold Ohlendorf.

When things looked bleak, Mr. Buchanan never lost his drive, never stopped working, and there is no telling how much those four gentlemen spent out of their own pockets to finance the trips that had to be made "up north" to contact the industrial headquarters and make the sales presentation about the attraction of Osceola.

Some 2,000 people now employed on the Industrial Park, their families, and the entire community well know and appreciate this work.

"Mr. Buck" never quit, until a few years ago, and he can register more enthusiasm than anyone in the State of Arkansas about his home town and how it is still due growth and economic expansion.

Mr. Buchanan began his association with the Chevrolet Motor Co. in 1925. He is a native of Neboville, Tenn. and began "coming across The River to Blytheville to sell automobiles when he was in knee britches." He spent 20 years in Blytheville before being able to acquire the operation of the agency in Osceola. Since that time, he has, with his valued associates, made the Osceola agency one of the most successful in the nation and he has been highly recognized by his fellow dealers on district and regional levels and by General Motors, several times.

As a widower, Mr. Buchanan married the former Miss June Armintrout in 1937 and this is one fine lady. The daughter, Helen, and her husband, Dewey Neely, say, "June has been everything a mother could be to us." The grandchildren, Kerri, Jay Lynn and Fanny, echo those sentiments.

"Mrs. Buck" was an expert insurance agency secretary for years then she joined the automobile firm and for years she has been a perfect complement to her husband. To everyone who comes calling, she has a friendly smile and a cheerful greeting, but she never intrudes herself.

In recent years, Mr. and Mrs. Buchanan have been taking long vacations, in Arizona, and at other noted spots but they seem to have been around home much lately.

"Buck" has been a member of the Osceola Rotary Club for many years, and he always seems to have a happy good time at the luncheons but here, also, he doesn't try to occupy the spotlight.

His great business knowhow has resulted in the establishment of two other Chevrolet agencies, the Bill Childers place in Poplar Bluff, Mo. and the Charles Cannon place in Ponca City, Okla.

What prompted this piece about Mr. Buchanan this week were the thoughts of this writer about our own personal relationship.

We've had some rugged political differences but they never became personal. He made it plain always that such differences had nothing with our doing business with each other and using each others products and services where such would be of benefit.

And you'll have to give him credit. He stands up for what he believes, for the good of the community, and he'll speak out plainly. Perhaps that's the best test of all of a good citizen—his activity in local politics, his drive, sometimes controversial, in community affairs, have never cost him a dime's worth of business.

Seeing him active around the auto agency you'd never accuse him of being one of the Elder Businessmen of the City but he does take it much easier than he used to.

Because he has built an organization that will take care of the business, if need be, and he has built a reputation that will last.

PRESIDENCY SHOULD BE FORD TEST

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 24, 1973

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, in view of the latest evidence of President Nixon's unfitness to continue in office, it is most important that the Congress entertain second thoughts about confirming his nomination for the Vice Presidency. Regardless of the particular nominee's virtues, anyone handpicked by a man so committed to trampling the Constitution and laws of this democracy, must be thoroughly and rigorously examined to determine just what kind of President he will be.

Only the day before the firing of Archibald Cox and the abolition of the special prosecutor's office, Mr. William C. Barnard, chief editorial writer of the Cleveland Plain Dealer, wrote:

One year ago it was unthinkable that President Nixon might be impeached or forced to resign because of scandals in his administration. It is no longer unthinkable. . . . Because of these political uncertainties, Congress must not look at Ford in light of his vice presidential qualifications, but instead must determine whether he is capable of being president.

Bill Barnard displayed sharp foresight. But how could even he have known that just 24 hours after publishing that statement, the whole of the American people would suddenly cry out for the President's impeachment?

I wish to share with my colleagues the well-considered admonition Mr. Barnard has addressed to us:

PRESIDENCY SHOULD BE FORD TEST

There is a growing possibility that Richard M. Nixon may not serve out the final three years of his presidency.

This is a harsh observation, but it is one borne out by the incredible events of the past year. The reputations of President Nixon and his administration have been under constant assault for political treachery and immorality. There appears no letup to the barrage of accusations and evidence.

The following circumstances should be kept in mind when Congress considers the nomination of Gerald R. Ford to fill the vacancy in the office of vice president:

For the first time in the history of the United States a vice president has been forced to resign his office because of criminal wrongdoing.

Two former Nixon cabinet members, former Atty. Gen. John N. Mitchell and former Secretary of Commerce Maurice H. Stans, await trial on felony charges. They are under indictment for perjury. Former White House counsel John W. Dean III has been named a coconspirator with them.

Several lesser personages in the Nixon administration are under investigation or have been indicted for activities connected with the Watergate break-in or the President's re-election campaign.

And still the bottom is not in sight. Both the Senate committee and the U.S. attorney general are continuing their separate investigations. Special prosecutor Archibald Cox last week won a U.S. appellate court decision that ordered Nixon to turn over to a district judge presidential tape recordings related to Watergate. These are crucial and could exonerate or implicate the President.

Still another committee of Congress is investigating the use of government funds at President Nixon's private estates. The chairman of that committee has said evidence has been turned up that raises "serious questions of propriety."

Never has the presidency been so besmirched. Public opinion polls have never before recorded such low trust in the presidency. Seldom has Congress regarded the presidency so suspiciously.

One year ago it was unthinkable that the vice president and other top members of government might be forced to resign and face criminal prosecution. It is no longer unthinkable, it is now fact.

One year ago it was unthinkable that President Nixon might be impeached or forced to resign because of scandals in his administration. It is no longer unthinkable. The Watergate investigations have an uncontrolled momentum and no one can predict what their outcome will be.

It is in this atmosphere that Congress is considering the vice presidential nomination of Ford. Because of these political uncertainties, Congress must not look at Ford in light of his vice presidential qualifications, but instead must determine whether he is capable of being president.

President Nixon's removal from office is a possibility that is not relished, but it is a possibility that exists.

STATEMENT REGARDING WATERGATE TAPES

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 24, 1973

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the degree of confidentiality with which a U.S. President, as the head of a separate and independent branch of the Government, shall conduct his business has been in steady dispute with the Congress and the courts since the inception of the Republic.

President Nixon's position in this regard in connection with the Watergate tapes is neither more nor less than a part of this historic issue.

I thought that the compromise worked out to satisfy the court's order by furnishing verified summaries of the tapes was an intelligent approach which respected both public and Presidential interests. I believe Special Prosecutor Cox properly could have agreed to it. When he chose not to do so, his logical course was to resign in disagreement, as did the Attorney General.

Since this matter is one involving disagreement among legal experts on an ambiguous question of constitutional law, I do not regard impeachment of the President as a logical response to the situation.

Moreover, it appears to me that the President's subsequent action in releasing these tapes may set an unhappy precedent. How skillfully Judge Sirica handles them will have a lot to do with that. Advisers to Presidents could become reluctant to speak frankly knowing that their words might be freely publicized. Representatives of other nations might be inhibited unduly in discussing grave matters of state with American Presidents for the same reason.

In short, the real question here is not, as Cox said, whether we will have government by law rather than government by men, but whether we shall have government or whether we shall have a public mess.

AFL-CIO CALLS FOR RICHARD NIXON TO RESIGN OR BE IMPEACHED

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 24, 1973

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, the public outcry over the President's actions this past weekend has been amazing. On October 22, at the 10th Constitutional Convention of the AFL-CIO, the executive council adopted a resolution asking for the resignation of President Nixon, and in the event of his failure to resign, his impeachment. I have taken the liberty of placing this resolution into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, for the benefit of my colleagues:

STATEMENT BY THE AFL-CIO EXECUTIVE COUNCIL ON PRESIDENT NIXON TO THE 10TH CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION, BAL HARBOR, FLA., OCTOBER 22, 1973

The Constitutional crisis that began with what the White House once described as a "third-rate burglary" has now been brought to a head by the absolutely unprecedented and shocking actions of President Nixon within the last 48 hours.

In rapid succession, these events have taken place:

The President demanded that Attorney General Elliot Richardson fire special Watergate prosecutor Archibald Cox. Richardson refused and resigned. The President demanded that Deputy Attorney General William D. Ruckelshaus fire Cox. Ruckelshaus refused and was fired. The President ordered his Solicitor General, Robert H. Bork, to fire Cox, and Bork, now Acting Attorney General, complied. The President ordered the FBI to seal off the offices of the special prosecutor, the Attorney General and the Deputy Attorney General—thereby, in effect, taking possession of the Watergate evidence.

These incredible actions have revealed the extent to which Mr. Nixon is prepared to go to prevent the full disclosure of evidence relating to the Watergate cover-up and other charges of criminal conduct by high government officials. He had already refused the orders of two courts to turn nine of his tapes bearing on the Watergate matters over to Judge John Sirica.

The President seems determined not to discharge the chief obligation of his office. Article II, Section 3 of the Constitution states that, "he shall take care that the laws be faithfully executed." But Mr. Nixon seems utterly determined to frustrate the full and impartial administration of the law.

When the Senate Judiciary Committee confirmed the appointment of Cox, it acted with the understanding, spelled out in the guidelines drawn up by the Attorney General, on May 19, that he would have: "full authority with respect to . . . determining whether or not to contest the assertion of 'executive privilege' or any other testimonial privilege. . . . The attorney general will not countermand or interfere with the special prosecutor's decisions or actions. . . . The special prosecutor will not be removed from his duties except for extraordinary improprieties on his part."

The special prosecutor's decision to press forward on the legal front to obtain the President's tapes hardly constitutes an "extraordinary impropriety." On the contrary, it constitutes the fulfillment of his mandate to "review all documentary evidence available from any source, as to which he shall have full access."

Similarly, the refusal of Attorney General Richardson to fire Cox was in accordance with the understanding between him and the special prosecutor, which understanding was also at the basis of the Senate's confirmation of Mr. Richardson as Attorney General.

Mr. Nixon's determination to prevent judicial examination of his tapes, no matter what the cost to our constitutional system, can only further erode public confidence in him. When the President appears fearful of facing a Supreme Court composed in large measure of his own appointees, the public can scarcely resist the darkest speculations.

We believe that the American people have had enough. More than enough.

We therefore call upon Richard Nixon, President of the United States, to resign.

We ask him to resign in the interest of preserving our democratic system of government, which requires a relationship of trust and candor between the people and their political leaders.

We ask him to resign in the interest of restoring a fully functioning government, which his Administration is too deeply in disarray to provide.

We ask him to resign in the interest of national security.

If Mr. Nixon does not resign, we call upon the House of Representatives forthwith to initiate impeachment proceedings against him.

We also call upon the Congress to hold up further consideration of the President's Vice President-designate, Mr. Ford. Clearly, a President who has placed himself on the brink of impeachment should not be allowed to name his successor until the charges against him have been disposed of satisfactorily.

We concur completely with Archibald Cox, who said at the time of his dismissal: "Whether we shall continue to be a government of laws and not of men is now for Congress and ultimately the American people to decide."

Impeachment is not a prospect we contemplate with pleasure. No decent American can derive any partisan satisfaction whatever from the misfortune of his nation. And surely the American labor movement is not interested in aiding any reckless attacks on the Presidency. We are especially concerned about the office of the Presidency in these times of grave danger on the international front.

But the cause of peace and freedom in the world cannot be served by a discredited Presidency at home. Our allies' best hope—mankind's best hope—lies in the strength of our democratic institutions.

Justice may be done, the risks of not doing it being more than a democracy can safely bear.

CONGRATULATIONS TO JAMES DAVIS

HON. THOMAS M. REES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 24, 1973

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I would like to share with you the accomplishment of a constituent of mine, James Calvin Davis of Studio City, Calif. Jim has been approved as an Eagle

Scout and will receive the award at the Court of Honor of Troop No. 139 on November 3, 1973.

This young man has been very active in the Scouting program for several years. He recently exemplified the spirit of Scouting by building friendships with Scouts he met at the National Boy Scout Jamboree in August of this year, and by acting as host to two Japanese Scouts on their first visit to the United States. Jim still maintains a sincere correspondence with his former Japanese guests.

I am sure my colleagues will join with me in extending hearty congratulations to James Davis. He represents the large segment of our youth who constructively contribute to their communities and to whom our Nation will turn for guidance in the years to come.

UNITED NATIONS CELEBRATES ITS 28TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 24, 1973

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, today is the 28th annual celebration of United Nations Day throughout the world. It is a time when we should reflect on the history and accomplishments of this important institution, over the 28 tumultuous years of its existence.

It is particularly appropriate that as we celebrate United Nations Day 1973, we find it actively working toward the achievement of a durable cease fire to quell the raging warfare in the Middle East. The successful accomplishment of this will serve to silence the critics of the United Nations who feel that it no longer represents a viable institution for the solving of major world problems.

The United Nations can point to other significant achievements in the year 1973. The most significant action taken by the United Nations was the admittance of East and West Germany. This important action was interpreted by many international observers as a real breakthrough in solving the East-West tensions over the thorny questions of Germany.

It has been claimed by many international experts that the basis under which the United Nations was formed is no longer applicable today. Yet I contend that an international policy based on collective security is more viable today than at any other time in the 28 years of the United Nations' existence. With the emerging détente between the two super-powers, the United States and the Soviet Union, the emphasis will now shift to other major world powers such as China, Japan, and Germany, thus transferring our former bipolar world into a multipolar one. It is in this format that the United Nations can serve its most useful function.

It is in light of these facts that this year's celebration of United Nations Day is truly a significant event. I look forward to its continued growth and hope its

influence is felt more in 1974 as we aim for the establishment for a generation of peace in the world.

IMPORTANCE OF A STRONG NATIONAL DEFENSE

HON. WILLIAM L. DICKINSON

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 24, 1973

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, on October 16, I was happy to invite a group of about 40 of our colleagues to meet informally with the distinguished Representative from Florida, Mr. LOUIS FREY, JR., who had just returned from a week in Israel. His acute observations, drawn from contact with Israeli civilian and military leaders all over the country, offered us a stark and chilling lesson in the need for defense preparedness. Let me give some examples:

First, the Israeli reserve forces were mobilized and committed to battle in 3 days. Some reserve units were in combat on the first day. Although the Arab forces apparently achieved considerable surprise, they were stopped without decisive military gains soon after the outset, by the very quick arrival of Israeli reservists. This is not to say that decisive psychological gains were not made.

There is a lesson for America here—an echo of 1776: We must have the desire to be and stay free. We have got to get behind our own Reserves and "get with it." The Reserve components, adequately trained and prepared, constitute an economical and essential insurance against threats to the United States.

Second, both sides in the Mid-East have been inflicting heavy damage with an assortment of very advanced antitank and antiaircraft systems. In fact, some are more sophisticated than any in our own arsenal. Arab effort centers around the sophisticated and highly mobile SA-6 and SA-7 antiaircraft missiles, and the Snapper antitank missile, all of which can deploy forward with armored units.

The SA-7 or Strella missile is man-portable, has a heat-sensing guidance system, and has been particularly effective against Israeli tank-fighter bomber teams. Press reports indicate that the Israelis have countered with the Shrike antiradiation missile, the Sparrow and Sidewinder air-to-air missiles, and a variety of electro-optical guided bombs.

Here is another lesson for thoughtful men: The combat environment of the future will be more uncertain than ever, as new technology is brought to bear. Supremacy in a future contest will depend greatly on current research and development, a field in which I would remind you that the Soviets are moving ahead with great speed. Obviously, we must mind our own progress here, and not fall asleep over the past success of American technology.

Third, there has been considerable surprise both in Israel and in this country that the Arab forces did not dissolve like a \$2 suit in a heavy rain once the

battle was fully joined. They have performed very creditably. Some Arab units have performed valorously. There is no question that rigorous training, improved leadership, and a sense of purpose have inspired both sides to do better. It is all a matter of attitude.

We, in America, should thereby recognize that a vigorous and spirited defense begins with a vigorous and spirited defense attitude. We cannot permit woolly-headed thinkers and flatulent critics to "rip off" the American military casually and destructively. Too much is at stake. We should instead nourish and invigorate the all-volunteer force by fostering constructive criticism when it is due, balanced praise when it has been earned, and by infusing the armed services with a keen sense of national responsibility and purpose.

Mr. Speaker, in an era of détente, when hopes are high for a structure of lasting peace, the Mid East war reminds us brutally that any such structure will be fragile, uncertain, and filled with latent danger.

It is not militarism to understand this; it is not warmongering to prepare against such hazards. It is, rather, basic to our discharge of citizenship. And the thoughtful, patriotic citizen should be in the forefront of such understanding. He will turn away from it at his peril and to the peril of all.

EXTENSION OF ENVIRONMENTAL EDUCATION ACT NOT NEEDED

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 24, 1973

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, when the Environmental Education Act was enacted in 1970, it was not envisioned as a permanent piece of legislation. Its purpose was to encourage State and local school authorities to develop and support environmental education programs.

This purpose has certainly been achieved. Public awareness of environmental issues has probably never been at a higher level. Hundreds of environmental programs have been instituted, many of them initiated by students, teachers, and communities without any money from the Federal Government.

Today, however, we are asked to extend the Environmental Education Act for 3 years at a cost of \$45 million. Despite the fact that the goals of the program have been achieved, many Congressmen seem intent on expending another \$45 million for this bill rather than risk being labeled anti-environment.

This program should be terminated. We should not extend the act for an additional 3 years simply because it has the word "environment" in its title.

The following minority views on this legislation were joined in by Mr. LANDGREBE, Mr. HUBER, and myself:

MINORITY VIEWS ON H.R. 3927

There is no valid reason for extending the Environmental Education Act.

First of all, the Act was never intended to be permanent. Its purpose was to stimulate nationwide interest in environmental education—a goal which, as explained by Assistant Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare Sidney P. Marland in his testimony before the Select Education Subcommittee, has been fulfilled.

There is, we trust, no doubt that environmental and ecological issues have been brought to the "height of public consciousness." If there is any other issue presently more "sacred" to the public, we are not aware of it. As evidence, one need only note that Congress, never an institution to be out of step with the "public interest," has passed a virtual tidal wave of legislation designed to "protect the environment." As further evidence, one need only observe the extreme reluctance of many Members of Congress to oppose H.R. 3927, even though they agree that the program has served its purpose; apparently the fear of being labeled "anti-environment" is just too much to cope with.

Secondly, extension of the Environmental Education Act is inconsistent not only with the President's budget request but with his government reform strategy as well. The Act represents the sort of unduly narrow, categorical program which the Administration is in the process of phasing out in favor of broader categories of assistance which leave more decision making in the hands of State and local school officials. Since there is an automatic one-year extension of this Act, we have until June 30, 1974, to phase out funding under this authority and intergrade environmental educational efforts into the various broader authorities for Federal aid to education if we do so choose.

Let us acknowledge that this program has fulfilled its intended goal. Let us not waste the taxpayers money by extending an act simply because it has the word "environment" in its title.

EARL F. LANDGREBE,
JOHN M. ASHERBOOK,
ROBERT J. HUBER.

WILLIAM McPHERSON MCGILL

HON. GOODLOE E. BYRON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 24, 1973

Mr. BYRON. Mr. Speaker, last week William McPherson McGill, one of Frederick County's most distinguished citizens, passed away. Mr. McGill, a Frederick County schoolteacher for 48 years, was the last teacher in the county to teach in a one-room school.

William McGill is remembered as a "Gentleman of the Old School" who kept his pupils on a strict schedule timed by his gold watch, who taught the three R's, plenty of geography and the flora and fauna of the woods and fields around his schools. He gave up a principal's job at Foxville to keep alive Phillips Delight, a one-room elementary school on the mountain near Catoclin Hollow.

Mr. McGill began teaching in 1910 at the Catoclin Furnace School. He served at Creagerstown Elementary, Ijamsville, the Deerfield School, Graceham, Bloomfield, Phillips Delight, and Foxville. He retired in 1955. William McPherson McGill will be sorely missed by his family and friends and his many ex-students. His many contributions to education and his community will be long remembered.

TELEPHONE PRIVACY IN KENTUCKY

HON. LES ASPIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 24, 1973

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, the assistant attorney general of Kentucky, Mr. Robert V. Bullock, has informed me that a telephone solicitation act will be presented to the Kentucky Legislature in January 1974, for its consideration.

I have sponsored in the House for the past 2 years a telephone privacy bill which will allow individuals to place a no-trespassing sign on their telephone. Individual telephone subscribers will be able to indicate that they do not wish to be solicited over the phone for commercial reasons.

Kentucky's proposal goes much further and makes it unlawful for any person to solicit the sale of merchandise or services by telephoning a prospective purchaser at his home.

Similar legislation has also been introduced in the Virginia Senate and public hearings have been held.

Telephone privacy, I believe, is the right of every citizen. I am hopeful that through either Federal legislation or actions by individual States that telephone subscribers will be able to halt the relentless attempts of telephone salesmen to hawk their wares over the phone.

A copy of the proposed Kentucky statute follows:

CONSUMERS' ADVISORY COUNCIL, DEPARTMENT OF LAW: AN ACT RELATING TO TELEPHONE SOLICITATION

Be it enacted by the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Kentucky:

Section 1. A new section of Chapter 367 of the Kentucky Revised Statutes is created to read as follows:

It shall be unlawful for any person to solicit the sale of merchandise, goods or services primarily to be used for personal, family or household purposes by telephoning a prospective purchaser in his home.

Section 2. A new section of Chapter 367 of the Kentucky Revised Statutes is created to read as follows:

Section one of this act shall not apply to any telephone solicitation of a prospective purchaser who has an established charge account, or an established course of sales transactions between the prospective purchaser and the seller or company causing the solicitation.

Section 3. A new section of Chapter 367 of the Kentucky Revised Statutes is created to read as follows:

Section 1 of this Act shall not apply to non-profit charitable organizations who solicit for funds or charitable donations only, and who do not offer an accompanying sale of merchandise, goods or services, whose sales price does not exceed \$3.00.

Section 4. A new section of Chapter 367 of the Kentucky Revised Statutes is created to read as follows:

Any person who conducts telephone solicitations to prospective purchasers in violation of this Act shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and be fined not less than \$500 nor more than \$1,000 or confined for 6 months or both, and for the second offense shall be fined not less than \$500 nor more than \$1,000 and shall be confined for not less than 30 days nor more than 90 days, and for conviction of a third offense shall be fined not less than \$500 nor more than \$1,000 and confined for not less than 90 days nor more than 10 months, and the Attorney General or a Com-

monwealth Attorney or a County Attorney may prosecute for a violation of this Act.

SPACE TECHNOLOGY

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 24, 1973

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, a recent article in the Lincoln Star by Dick Holman, Friday, September 14, 1973, discusses several innovations which were directly derived from our national space program. I include Mr. Holman's article in the RECORD as an example of the many and continuing contributions that our national space program is making to the daily lives of every American:

SPACE TECHNOLOGY OFFERS BETTER CHUCK-HOLE FILLER

(By Dick Holman)

Lincoln's chuck-hole problem—the bane of winter and spring motorists—could be solved with the technology that helped send man into space.

Louis Mogavero of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) explained Thursday that the chuck-hole remedy is one of many spin-offs—new techniques and materials developed in the space effort—that NASA is offering the public.

"We try to return to the taxpayer some of his investment in the space and aeronautics program," said Mogavero, deputy director of NASA's technology utilization office.

He told newsmen that NASA wants to transfer technology to supply the needs of users—and let the free enterprise system take over."

For example, Mogavero said NASA learned municipalities are looking for a better chuck-hole filler that won't sink or crack. NASA took a thermoplastic used chemically to bind solid rocket propellants, adapted its technology and tested it.

"From preliminary observations," he said, "it seems a better mix" than what's available now.

Another NASA space spin-off has become available only in recent weeks: the rechargeable heart pacemaker.

NASA adapted a long-term battery developed for satellite power systems. The agency applied the same reliable miniaturized circuitry to the pacemaker.

NO OPERATION

"All the patient does now is put on a vest, plug it in and recharge the battery through induction." The innovation precludes expensive and hazardous operations required to recharge earlier pacemakers, he said.

NASA offers the spin-offs to municipalities, industry, business and entrepreneurs for free, Mogavero said; yet he said "we have trouble" convincing them to commercialize the technology for public use.

However, great numbers of spin-offs have already been put to practical applications.

Mogavero explained that a woman paralyzed from the neck down now operates her arm with very fine movements using a tongue switch. "For the first time in 18 years, she wrote a letter to her daughter," he said.

The switch was adapted from NASA's remote control devices.

EYE SWITCH

Because of tremendous G-forces that pinned astronauts to their seats, NASA developed a light sensor that reflects into the the astronauts' eyes and allows them to manipulate controls by mere eye movement.

That same technology, Mogavero said, has been adapted to allow an invalid to guide his wheel chair.

In nonmedical advances, he said, one spin-off allows inexpensive extraction of pure costly metals from abandoned cars. Another rapidly detects drug use through urinalysis, a technique "so finely tuned that it can pick up the casual user—once a week," he explained.

For the refrigerator in the home or the refrigerated boxcar, he showed a tiny IWI, an irreversible warning indicator, which indicates by color change if frozen goods have thawed.

The IWI costs two cents in large quantities and six cents in smaller quantities, and can prevent food poisoning, for example, if the power went out while a family was out of town.

BEGAN IN 1962

In an address to the Professional Engineers of Nebraska Thursday evening, Mogavero said the technology utilization program began in 1962.

He explained how NASA teams all over the U.S. "seek out technical problems that might lend themselves to solution by adaptations of existing space technology."

When a technology can be applied for commercial use, the information can be extracted from NASA's data bank or NASA puts the party in direct contact with the NASA inventor or innovator, he said.

"One of the problems we are working on is to effect changes in the NASA patent policy that ought to encourage more businessmen to use technology which is patented," he said. "NASA is now able to accelerate commercial use (of spin-offs) by granting exclusive licenses much earlier than was allowed under the old regulations."

Mogavero emphasized that "all this is not NASA hornblowing. It represents long hours of work and promotion of the idea that the taxpayers are entitled to maximum mileage for their hard-earned space dollars."

LOTTERIES: VICE AND VIRTUE

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 24, 1973

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, at the present time in the city of Chicago, there are many who advocate a city lottery. Their argument is that since criminal lotteries take in \$100 million a year and benefit only those who illegally operate them, and since a legal lottery would benefit the city, that it be instituted.

In fact, a report by the chairman of the license commission was given to the city council which declared that a legal city lottery would gross at least \$150 million.

A number of States have entered the gambling business. The arguments for doing so are similar to those now being heard in Chicago. Too often, the arguments against doing so are not given the hearing they deserve.

We have all heard the argument that since people gamble anyway, why not benefit the State. George Will, writing in the Washington Post, expresses the view that this is no reason for Government to enter a self-destruction business on a grand scale.

Irving Kristol, writing in the Wall Street Journal, declares that—

The case for legalized gambling is, at bottom, simply an argument in favor of the

government raising revenues by swindling its citizens rather than taxing them.

When we speak of legalized gambling, Kristol notes, we are not speaking of simply rescinding the laws which make gambling illegal. He notes that—

We are, in most cases, talking about legalizing it in a very special way—i.e., either as socialized industry or a regulated and monopolistic (or oligopolistic) "public utility." And we are inclined to think, these days, that such an extension of the public sector represents a natural increment to the "welfare state."

When government gets into the gambling business, according to Mr. Kristol:

It necessarily assumes the responsibilities for seeing that this business grows and prospers. In effect, it proclaims that gambling is not a necessary evil but an inherently good thing. And it does this while telling its citizens that, if they are to be good Americans, they should work hard, save their money, shun all get-rich schemes. Is this not ridiculous?

If we believe that gambling should be legalized, then the thing to do is simply to repeal the laws prohibiting it. Gambling then would become a free and open part of the marketplace.

What those who seek State and city run lotteries are asking for, however, is something far different, it is not the legalization of gambling, but its socialization.

Concluding his article, Mr. Kristol writes that—

If we legalize gambling in principle and then socialize it to boot, we have declared that it is in no way a blameworthy activity. That's going too far.

I wish to share this important article by Irving Kristol, which appeared in the September 13, 1973, Wall Street Journal, with my colleagues, and insert it into the Record at this time:

VICE AND VIRTUE IN LAS VEGAS

(By Irving Kristol)

LAS VEGAS, NEV.—They smiled indulgently when I said I was going to visit my sister and brother-in-law in Las Vegas. Oddly enough, I was telling the truth—well, half the truth anyway. The other half of the truth, of course, was that I was going to Las Vegas to indulge in the vice of gambling.

I use the word "vice" advisedly. The kind of gambling one does in Las Vegas is a vice. We are not, after all, talking about a friendly and convivial game of poker or canasta. That is more in the nature of "gaming" than of gambling. There is nothing friendly or convivial about Las Vegas. It is all impersonal and solitary—one abandons oneself to fantasies of omniscience, omnipotence, and of getting something for nothing. It most definitely undermines the classical virtues (moderation, self-reliance, self-discipline, thrift, diligence, etc.) while nourishing the classical vices (extravagance, avarice, the lack of social responsibility, etc.). Moralists and psychiatrists agree that this kind of gambling is altogether a bad thing; which is, I suppose, why it is so intensely pleasurable.

I have always been rather fond of Las Vegas because it candidly is an utterly vicious place (i.e., a place for vice). Despite the big-name entertainment and the lavish decor, everyone knows what the business of Las Vegas is, and everyone knows what transactions he has come to participate in. Set in the midst of a barren desert, with no industry of any kind, no pretty scenery or natural charms, Las Vegas exists for sinning and nothing else.

Or at least it used to. For Las Vegas is changing. Not only are more and more people coming every year—they are a different kind of people. Las Vegas now boasts a Holiday Inn and a Howard Johnson's. And it is attracting, in ever greater numbers, a Holiday Inn and Howard Johnson's crowd—cluttered station wagons, yelping dogs, whining children and all. The Chamber of Commerce is very proud of the fact that so many "middle Americans" are now casually stopping off here for a few days of fun and games. I am appalled. It is not only that they will ruin Las Vegas as an authentic city of occasional sin; these are people who are helping to obliterate the distinction between vice and innocent entertainment—a distinction crucial to a self-governing polity, in which (to borrow a phrase from "America the Beautiful") we propose to "confirm our soul in self control."

DANGER AHEAD

Las Vegas inverts the normal moral situation: here, vice is public and only virtue is a private affair. Such inversion is tolerable so long as one realizes how abnormal it is. But once Las Vegas comes to be regarded as just another vacation resort, to which one takes the family without a qualm, we are in danger of losing our moral bearings. Las Vegas may end up more virtuous—but only by de-moralizing the rest of the country.

The significance of the changes under way in American manners and morals is highlighted by the latest issue of *Forbes* to reach the Las Vegas newsstands. Its lead story, "Gambling: the Hottest Growth Industry?" predicts—with a confidence not to be challenged—the growing legalization of gambling in state after state. The cover is graced with a photograph of the late W. C. Fields peering from behind a "hand" of cards. Only four cards are visible; the fifth is presumably up his sleeve.

Now, I yield to no man in my admiration of W. C. Fields. A world without such deviants and eccentrics and rebels against morality would be a tedious place. But for a W. C. Fields to emerge in full splendor, he needs a "straight" milieu. One can envisage him easily enough at a typical Holiday Inn, selling snake oil or running a crooked game of bingo. In Las Vegas, he'd be trampled to death by the rush of housewives to the slot machines.

Do we really want to go the way of legalized gambling? There are important issues involved, which no one seems to be seriously discussing. In part, this is because serious discussion of moral issues—e.g., drugs, pornography, sexual promiscuity—goes against the spirit of the age, which would have trouble recognizing a moral issue if it ran over one on Main Street, in broad daylight. But in the case of gambling there is another reason why the moral aspect of the matter is so vigilantly ignored. This is because, when we are talking about legalizing gambling, we are in most cases talking about legalizing it in a very special way—i.e., either as socialized industry or a regulated and monopolistic (or at least oligopolistic) "public utility." And we are inclined to think, these days, that such an extension of the public sector represents a natural increment to the "welfare state."

The most common argument in favor of legalizing gambling is that a lot of people gamble anyway, so why make it a criminal activity? Let's "de-criminalize" it and thereby reduce the crime statistics. Despite its superficial plausibility, this argument makes little sense. If it is to be applied to gambling, it can be applied with equal cogency to faith-healing, "pyramid" sales schemes, and all such activities, now illegal, where the victim is a willing participant in the crime. The SEC does not sanction stock market swindles, even where the odds against the investor are scrupulously spelled out somewhere in a prospectus. And gambling—as distinct from what I have called "gambling"—is, technically, a

swindle; the payoffs on bets must be less than fair, and the overwhelming majority of the "investors" must eventually lose their money, if the gambling enterprise is to survive and prosper.

Besides being unconvincing, this argument in favor of legalized gambling is disingenuous. Just how disingenuous may be discovered by asking the question: If we wish to legalize gambling, why not simply erase the prohibitions from the law books and leave the rest to private enterprise? The rejoinder will be either (a) that gambling under private enterprise will cheat the ordinary more than the state will (which is not always true, as every horse-better in New York City knows), or (b) that profits from such a sinful activity as gambling ought not to line private pockets but should rather be directed into the public purse. That last proposition is clearly absurd in its moral logic; as George Will has pointed out in *The Washington Post*, the fact that government cannot prevent people from being self-destructive is no reason for government to go on a grand scale. But morally absurd or not, this is the argument that counts. The case for legalized gambling is, at bottom, simply an argument in favor of the government raising revenues by swindling its citizens rather than by taxing them.

The article in *Forbes* makes it quite clear that the impetus for legalized gambling comes from the promise it holds of raising substantial revenues in a "painless" way. When the idea of legalized gambling began to take shape some years back, our state budgets were indeed in bad shape. But today that is no longer the case. For various reasons—revenue sharing, the declining birth rate, general prosperity—most states are now running budgetary surpluses, and tax cuts are becoming more common than tax increases. Nevertheless, there are a great many people in our society whose notion of "progressive" politics is always to be thinking of new ways for the government to spend money for the welfare of its citizens. And since taxation is unpopular, these people have persuaded themselves that it is in the public interest for the government to swindle its citizens so that it can then launch programs that would improve their lives, materially and spiritually.

As a result, various forms of legalized gambling are already in existence in several states while other states are contemplating the inauguration of them. And we have learned something very interesting from our experience so far. This is that legalized gambling, if it is to "work" (i.e., raise revenues), must be run like any other business selling any other commodity. It has to be advertised and promoted: non-gamblers have to be persuaded to gamble. It has to be attractively packaged: there must be various forms of gambling to suit pocketbooks large and small, and to satisfy diverse tastes for a speculative fling. It must be innovative: new modes of gambling have to be devised and introduced, lest people become bored with losing their money. It must be deceptive: the odds against winning are emphatically not printed on your betting ticket. And both the stakes and the bets have constantly to be increased, so people can ignore their continuing losses while dreaming of an ultimate "killing."

DOES IT MAKE SENSE?

In short, when government gets into the gambling business it necessarily assumes the responsibilities for seeing that this business grows and prospers. In effect, it proclaims that gambling is not a necessary evil but an inherently good thing. And it does this while telling its citizens that, if they are to be good Americans, they should work hard, save their money, shun all get-rich-quick schemes. Is this not ridiculous? Does it really make sense for the government to insist that no one has

a legal right to work for a penny less than the minimum wage and for the government then to encourage us all to blow our week's wages at the betting cage? Does it really make sense for the government to enact a mountain of legislation—from SEC registration to the labeling of consumer products—which protects people from unwise expenditures while urging them to make the unwise expenditure of all, i.e., a gambling bet?

Of course it is ridiculous. And dishonest. And corrupting, both of people and government. But the urge to spend the people's money for the people's welfare is so powerful (and so mindless) that it actually comes to seem proper to cheat the people in order to get this money to spend on their welfare. This is paternalism run amok.

I have no doubt that there are some silly anti-gaming laws on the books—petty laws, ineffectual laws, which ought simply to be repealed. And if we really are tired and bored with enforcing the laws against gambling, then the honest thing to do is to repeal them as well. Gambling will then be the free folly of an individual.

But if we legalize gambling in principle, and then socialize it to boot, we have declared that it is in no way a blameworthy activity. That's going too far. One Las Vegas, far away and only sometimes visited, we can easily tolerate—even benignly tolerate. But one is quite enough.

MR. NIXON TAKES A WHITEWASH

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 24, 1973

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, despite the President's recent action in complying with the U.S. District Court of Appeals' decision that he hand the disputed tapes over to Judge Sirica, serious questions still remain as to whether the investigation into his administration's activities will be able to continue unimpeded. It is, I think, most important that Congress immediately act to reestablish, by statute, the office of the special prosecutor, thereby insuring its independence from the President and the Executive Branch.

I am taking the liberty of inserting Mr. Tom Wicker's article on this subject which appeared in the October 23 edition of the *New York Times*. I am sure that my colleagues will be interested in Mr. Wicker's remarks on the need for an independent investigation into the Nixon administration's activities:

MR. NIXON TAKES A WHITEWASH

(By Tom Wicker)

WASHINGTON.—Richard Nixon has ordered his own whitewash. He has put an end to an investigation of his Administration's activities that he had promised would be independent, unhindered and complete, and he has reasserted his political direction of the Department of Justice.

In so doing, Mr. Nixon has made it impossible that any Justice Department continuation of the Cox investigation could be credible, conclusive or acceptable to the American people, much less effective in uncovering wrongdoing. If Mr. Nixon had wanted a no-holds-barred inquiry, he would not have fired Special Prosecutor Cox; if the Justice Department now attempts to provide such an investigation anyway, Mr. Nixon has left no doubt that he will stop that, too, by firing the next crop of investigators.

That the Watergate investigation has been quashed by the man being investigated should not be obscured by all the diversions this devious politician has prepared to disguise it. White House lawyers apparently are going into court to argue that Mr. Nixon's unilateral proposal of a self-serving means of resolving the tapes controversy met the court requirement that he turn the tapes over to Judge Sirica. They will argue further that this proposal was indeed a "compromise," although it takes two sides to a controversy to make a compromise, and although, on its face, Mr. Nixon's proposal was more nearly a flat accompanied by a peremptory order to Mr. Cox not to return to the courts in further pursuit of the tapes.

It also is being argued that this Nixon power play is a compromise because it was accepted, more or less, by Senator Ervin, whose flabby inadequacy as an investigator was finally made clear, and by Senator Baker, who is a Republican Presidential possibility, on behalf of a committee that had no say in their decision. In fact, the committee already had been denied the tapes by the courts, so that the two Senators were not compromising but swallowing a Nixonian handout of sucker-bait. At that, they did not then know that their acceptance would be used to make Mr. Cox appear intransigent; although they presumably did know, as Mr. Nixon surely did, that whether or not they accepted on behalf of the Senate committee had no bearing on what the special prosecutor had to do on behalf of the grand jury for which he originally had sought the tapes.

As for Mr. Nixon's selection of John Stennis as auditor of the tapes—a political master-stroke—it is no reflection on Mr. Stennis' undoubted veracity to inquire why he, but not a Federal judge in his chambers, should pass on the accuracy of the "summaries" Mr. Nixon proposed to provide; or to point out that the proposal would set aside the normal judicial process, by Nixonian decree, in favor of an ad hoc arrangement with nothing to recommend it but the reputation of one elderly and infirm man. As Mr. Cox explained, moreover, however John Stennis might vouch for them, no court would or should accept "summaries" rather than the tapes themselves as evidence for either the prosecution or any defendant—which may be something Mr. Nixon had in mind all along.

All of these matters are diversionary and are being advanced by White House double-talk artists in order to hide from the public the snuffing out of Archibald Cox's special investigation, and the reassertion of the same kind of political control of the Justice Department that made Mr. Cox's appointment necessary in the first place.

That appointment was forced upon Mr. Nixon by Congress because the Senate would not have confirmed Elliot Richardson as Attorney General without the promise that a special prosecutor would be named and given independent powers to investigate; and Mr. Richardson's resignation was in recognition of that promise and of its violation by Richard Nixon. Therefore, Congress has no choice, if it is not to see its expressed will thwarted by Mr. Nixon's perfidy, but to reestablish a special and independent investigation in such a manner that Mr. Nixon cannot nullify it by whatever new tricks he may devise.

How this may be done, as to a general investigation into all the alleged offenses, is not clear, but as to Mr. Nixon himself, there is ready at hand a resolution by Representative B. F. Sisk of California that the House of Representatives establish a select committee to inquire into the question of impeachment. To impeach, which only the House can do, is not to remove Mr. Nixon from office but to indict him in specified charges, which then would be turned over to the Senate for a fair trial on the merits of the case.

Mr. Nixon could not quash such a constitutionally based House inquiry. He could not contend that it violated the separation of powers. If he refused to respond to its subpoena, the committee of inquiry could draw its own conclusions, and make its own recommendations. By thwarting the legal process, Mr. Nixon has asked for precisely such political judgment.

TAPIRS, TAKINS, KINODO DRAGONS—ONLY AT THE BRONX ZOO, AND SOON A MONORAIL, TOO

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 24, 1973

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the Bronx Zoological Park, no doubt the finest institution of its kind, plans a most exciting new endeavor—a 40-acre Asiatic wildlife complex for such exotic creatures as kinodo dragons, Siberian tigers, giant bats, mouse deer, takins, gaurs, clouded leopards, and tapirs. And to protect the animals and the viewers from each other, there are plans to build a ground level monorail that can be halted at the command of the guide any time something unusual happens among the animals.

This project exemplifies the best efforts of zoo planners to provide the excitement and wildness of a first-class zoo in an urban setting. It would be regrettable if the money needed to realize these plans were not forthcoming. The museum services bill (H.R. 10596) designed to provide project grants and technical assistance would, if enacted, help to insure the success of endeavors such as that planned for the Bronx Zoo.

I commend to the attention of my colleagues an article appearing in the New York Times on October 19:

ASIA IS COMING TO THE BRONX ZOO
(By Murray Schumach)

A monorail with expert lecturers, will be the style in which visitors to the Bronx Zoo's projected 40-acre Asiatic wildlife complex will watch kinodo dragons, Siberian tigers, elephants, rhinoceros, giant bats, mouse deer, the largest wild cattle in the world and other exotic creatures from the Arabian Peninsula to Java.

Moreover, the ground-level monorail will be built in such fashion that although it will run alongside the Bronx River Parkway for a stretch, as well as across the Bronx River, the rider will at all times, be turned from views of traffic and other unpleasant reminders of urban civilization.

This, and other aspects of the Asian exhibition that will be mostly outdoors, were disclosed yesterday by William G. Conway, director of the Bronx Zoo, after he appeared before the City Planning Commission, at City Hall, to urge inclusion of \$5.5-million by the city for this development.

"The complex will be the most exciting thing of its kind ever built," Mr. Conway said. He said that the monorail will be able to be halted at the command of the guide any time he sees anything unusual happening among the animals.

NO NUTS, PLEASE

After leaving the hearing, he said that the New York Zoological Society has already committed itself to \$6.5-million and that the

work has started on the plans that the city has looked upon favorably in the past.

"The smallest section of this Asiatic wildlife complex," he said, "will be bigger than our present African plains for the lions." The plains cover about three acres and is now the zoo's largest display.

Mr. Conway, when asked if youngsters would be able to give peanuts to the elephants as they roam the outdoor Asian area, replied:

"No. We want to stop this custom of giving peanuts to elephants. The peanuts are no better for elephants than they are for people."

Included in the new exhibition area will be a building that will contain slithering pythons, treetop-swinging orangutans, and the komodo dragons.

SCHOOL IS PLANNED

One of the major outdoor features will be the Siberian tigers, of which the zoo now has a breeding group that has enabled the institution to raise between four and seven cubs a year. This work is particularly important because Mr. Conway said that there are now believed to be less than 180 Siberian tigers in their natural state left in the world.

Once the Asiatic exhibition is open, the zoo's old lion house will be phased out and be replaced by a school to teach conservation. Live animals will be part of the courses at this school.

The designer of the new exhibition is Morris Ketchum and Associates, of 919 Third Avenue, architects for the widely acclaimed World of Birds and World of Darkness at the Bronx Zoo.

Among other creatures in the new Asian exhibition, Mr. Conway continued, will be cranes, tapirs, takins (relatives of the musk ox, which are from Boreno), gaur, or giant wild cattle, that stand six feet at the shoulder; clouded leopards and flying foxes, which are bats with five-foot wingspreads.

Mr. Conway said that very few trees would have to be cut down for the new exhibition and that the natural beauty of the area would be protected since the building will be partly underground and be almost concealed by trees and other greenery.

Mr. Conway said that the New York Zoological Society began planning the project in 1969 and is hopeful that the first stage—the outdoor phase—will be open by 1975 and that the indoor section will be completed a year later.

The area for evoking Asia in the Bronx will run from the zoo's southern boundary at 180th Street north almost to the Pelham Parkway, and east from the Bronx River to the Bronx River Parkway. It is an underdeveloped tract within the zoo's 252 acres.

SECRETARY OF ARMY CALLAWAY DISCUSSES VOLUNTEER ARMY

HON. WILLIAM L. DICKINSON

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 24, 1973

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, recently I spoke on the floor of the House regarding the concept of an All-Volunteer Army and the fact that more support ought to be given to this effort.

Last Monday the Secretary of the Army, the Honorable Howard H. Callaway, addressed the Association of the U.S. Army convention here in Washington on this same subject. The Secretary's remarks should be of interest to other Members of the Congress and I, there-

fore, am inserting them in the RECORD at this point:

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE HOWARD H. CALLAWAY

Ladies and Gentlemen, distinguished guests:

I'm delighted to have this opportunity to be with you this afternoon. We in the Army are aware of your long-standing support for a strong National defense and we feel that the Nation owes you a debt of gratitude.

It is an exciting time for me to be Secretary of the Army. We are entering a historic time, a time of basic change, as we try to do what has never been done before. The Army has set out to provide security for this great country, to keep our global commitments, to stand ready to face an aggressor on a moment's notice—and to do all this with an Army of volunteers. No nation in history has tried to meet such massive and complex commitments without compelling people to serve, through one form of conscription or another. It is a challenge—a great challenge, one which I assure you we are doing our utmost to meet. Today I want to address this question with you—this question of meeting the need for an Army with a volunteer force.

Unfortunately, discussions of the volunteer Army are usually accompanied by emotional considerations about the value of the draft or of Universal Military Training. There are many, both in the military and out, who genuinely feel that the maintenance of a draft is important to our country, and so the debate continues. But the debate is on the wrong subject.

Those who continue to hold out the false hope that the Army can or ought to simply dodge the problems of the volunteer environment by quick return to the draft are not facing up to today's realities. The country doesn't want a draft today. The Congress doesn't want a draft today. The alternative then is a successful volunteer Army or failure for the Army. The US Army has never failed this country. It has always turned the hard challenges of history into success. So today, the challenge for all of us who support the Army is clear. We must set our minds to making the volunteer Army work.

And the volunteer Army is working! It is working because there are still young men and women in America who want to serve their country—this is "an idea whose time remains" for all Americans, young and old, of every race, color, and creed. And it is working because the Army offers to young men and women a satisfying life and solid benefits in conjunction with their service. There are those who feel we are trying to buy an Army. This is not the case. We are giving young men and women who serve in the Army a standard of living that is roughly comparable to the standard of living they might get in the civilian community for doing a similar job. This means higher pay; paid annual leave; complete, superb medical and dental care; life in much improved barracks, and more.

All of these measures are necessary. I support them wholeheartedly. But let me emphasize that we are not trying to buy an Army! We will get the Army that the Nation needs only by appeal to sacrifice and service.

And this brings me to the second, most important way that we are making the volunteer Army work, by insuring that service to the country is a meaningful part of the young man or woman's life. We are making Army service a step forward in their lives, not an interruption. And to do this we are putting a great emphasis on education and training, and on insuring that our soldiers' jobs are important and useful.

We are doing this by making each soldier's job relate to the Army's mission, because this makes Army service mean something. Our young people want value from their

lives. They want a job that matters and we've got that job. We are also working to eliminate unnecessary irritants. We think this will make the Army more attractive, and our surveys have borne this out.

We have developed a very attractive package of education and training. To the high school dropout who has the ability and motivation, we offer work toward a high school diploma, as an adjunct to training. To the high school graduate, an opportunity for college training, part of which may be as an adjunct to training. To junior college and college students, the possibility of further training, and even this may be as an adjunct to training. And to all of them, the Army offers vocational training that will be useful when the soldier returns to civilian life.

With a meaningful job, a decent standard of living, and real opportunity for continued education and training, young men and women can look upon a period of service to the country as a genuine step forward in their lives. And when they leave the Service, they will realize other very important advantages. For one thing, under the GI Bill, they are entitled to more education, provided by the government to its veterans. And they are more mature. The Army has trained them, given them each a mission, and then held them responsible for professional results. This responsibility develops maturity. Thus, both the education and experience of military service prepare them for better jobs when they leave the Army for civilian careers.

All of these benefits are pointed toward the first term volunteer. For those who choose to reenlist for the volunteer Army, however, more opportunities for education, maturity, and service accrue.

We have, today, the finest noncommissioned officer leadership training we have ever had, with progressive career steps going from the recruit right on through our top command sergeant major. Our men and women enjoy the benefits of our new Noncommissioned Officer Education System, a system which offers to the noncommissioned officer a progressive, professional military education roughly comparable to the superb system of schooling we have always offered to our officers. The system trains, educates, and motivates our NCO leaders for the progressive challenges of an Army career.

Some of our strongest supporters don't fully understand today's Army. They think the Army lost something important when we initiated, for example, the idea of hiring civilian help—KPs—to work in the kitchens and dining rooms. They think that eliminating such irritants as KP has made the Army soft. But the Army's mission is not to peel potatoes; its mission is to fight. Peeling potatoes does not improve discipline or combat efficiency. So changes to some things held traditional in the past are in the wind, but if you look at them, you will see that each turns harder than ever on mission. We are not retreating from the Army's real business. The volunteer Army is ready to fight.

We do not have and we shall not have a permissive Army. We have and we shall have a disciplined Army, responsive to authority, and able to perform its mission in the service of the country. You expect it; the country deserves it; and I'm going to do my level best to see that it happens.

In brief, that's the program we have undertaken to attract young people, to encourage them to enter the Army. And once they're in, I know that many of them will choose to stay beyond their initial commitment, because they will see that the Army has a very fine career progression system.

I believe Americans will agree, then, that we have a package that is appealing to today's young people, appealing not only in terms of benefits, but in the opportunity for service to country. And the beauty of this is that it appeals to everyone in America. Serv-

ice to country appeals equally to rich and poor, Northerner and Southerner, educated and uneducated. Pride in America and willingness to sacrifice for her is an ideal which knows no cultural or economic boundaries. In this fact lies the very strength of the Nation. I count on this appeal to give us an Army which mirrors America. It's not going to be a mercenary Army, it's going to be an all-American Army.

This then is our plan. It is not only our plan for the future, it is also a description of today's Army. For practical purposes, the draft ended for us on December 29, 1972, when the last draftee entered the Army. (Although a few deferred draftees entered later.) So we have had about 10 months' experience now in a volunteer environment, and I think it is appropriate that we review some of the results.

Because each month we openly discuss our goals and quotas, many have a distorted picture of our progress. They feel we are hopelessly short of recruiting goals, trying to make up the gap by lowering quality, and as a consequence, ending up with nothing worthwhile whatever. It is true that we have missed our goals during the past 10 months. But it is important to remember that our goals are akin to the salesman's goals—realistic, but difficult to meet.

What are the facts? During these past months, we have recruited into the volunteer Army some 124,000 young men and women; further, over 34,000 men and women have reenlisted during this period. In fact we have been running about 84 percent of our recruiting objective ever since December 29, 1972, when we abandoned the draft. And those who have come into the Army are of high quality. We have had a higher percentage of high school graduates entering the Army since the draft ended—about 10 percent higher—than we had in the 6 months before the end of the draft. As a result, we now have an Active Army of over 794,000 and this is 97 percent of our programmed strength. Total accessions, then, have fallen somewhat short of our goals, but we are still filled far above any level of concern, and quality is high.

And we have many encouraging signs. Last year we decided to reactivate the 9th Infantry Division at Fort Lewis, Washington, but the manpower was not at hand. So we told the commander, General Fulton, that if he wanted a division, to take his cadre, the Division colors, and go out and recruit a division. General Fulton and his recruiters did just that. They began a vigorous recruiting campaign and today that Division stands at 102 percent strength, essentially filled with enlisted volunteer soldiers. Now, this is a real success story, a living example which illustrates concretely that the volunteer Army program is not an impossible dream, but a workable idea, and it is typical of many other units with similar successes.

We do not minimize our recruiting problems; we spend our time and energy working on them. We are trying many new approaches to recruiting, which stress quality together with quantity—such as increasing the number of recruiters, expanding our unit-of-choice and station-of-choice options, screening out poor soldiers in our reenlistments, administering new entrance tests, and even weeding out misfits in basic training. These efforts will continue.

Some also have expressed concern that the volunteer Army was doomed to failure because it would bring a decline in discipline. That has not been the case. If we compare discipline trends for FY 72 with FY 73, a period which includes both draft and volunteer Army experience, we find that rates for AWOL, desertion, crimes of violence, crimes against property, courts-martial, and separations under less than honorable conditions, are down.

Virtually every major indicator of discipline except drug offense has, in fact, re-

mained or turned positive in the volunteer Army. Whatever factors contribute to this picture, it is clear that today's volunteer soldier is not causing an increase in disciplinary problems.

Many also had expected the volunteer Army to herald the demise of our National Guard and Army Reserve as viable outfits. No such demise is in sight, although we do face problems here. We have seen modest reductions in the strengths of both our Reserve Components from the December 1972 levels, a trend in fact dating from mid-1971. But current indications give us some encouragement that we may be able to restrain this decline. We have in the past several months, for example, been successful in recruiting trained, experienced, prior-service personnel into our Reserve Components to offset some of our shortfall. As you know, Reserve Component strength remains critically important, so we are very much concerned that it continue to receive close attention. Under the total force policy any future emergency buildup will have to rely upon the National Guard and Reserve rather than a draft for initial and primary augmentation of our Active forces. I expect the improving image of the volunteer Army to have the positive effect on the health of our Reserve Component recruitment that is needed.

Finally, combat readiness, which is the heart of our business, has shown significant improvement. When the draft ended, we had 13 divisions on the books, but only 10 fully formed. Of the 13 divisions, only 4 met the Army's stringent readiness standards and were considered ready for combat. By contrast, we now have all 13 divisions fully operational and 10 ready for combat. Thus, our divisions today, judged by the stringent standards reported to the Joint Chiefs of Staff, much more nearly meet their goals in terms of authorized strength, personnel job qualification, unit training, equipment on hand, and equipment serviceability than they did at the end of the draft. Six months to a year from now, I believe our readiness posture will be even better.

These simple facts and figures point to one conclusion—The Army is better today than it was at the end of the draft. But the figures are not nearly so meaningful as the subjective feel of those in the Army. I certainly don't pretend to be an expert on this, but by the end of this month I will have visited all 13 of the Army's active divisions, as well as many other posts and stations. During every visit I have talked with new soldiers, with senior noncommissioned officers, with junior officers, with senior officers and commanders. I can tell you that without any question, today's Army is a far better Army, far more prepared for combat than it was at the end of the draft. I can just feel it everywhere I go. It's in the air. Discipline is better, morale is better, training is better, and equipment is better. The Army's future is indeed now.

And, what is more important, all of our vital trends, with the possible exception of drug abuse (and we are working hard and effectively on that one), are in the right direction today. Let me emphasize—your Army is good now, ready to fight, and getting better with the passage of time. I foresee no doom ahead. Six months from today we will be better, and after that, better still.

This picture that I give you of today's Army is enthusiastic and optimistic, and purposely so. I am extremely proud of today's Army and what has been done to make it work in the volunteer atmosphere. But I recognize our challenges. Benjamin Franklin once said that, "the man who expects nothing . . . shall never be disappointed." I believe he would share my belief that men who do expect something worthwhile and are willing to work hard for it, are apt to achieve it, even if the task is difficult and unfamiliar.

We are daily working on new, innovative,

and exciting ideas to insure that we get the right number of qualified men and women to man our Army. It will not be easy. It will perhaps be the toughest job that the U.S. Army has ever been called upon to do, but I am certain that today's Army will be equal to the challenge.

We in the Army have always needed the active support of the American people. Today, we need it even more than ever before. Even our strongest critics have recognized that the one vital element necessary for the success of the volunteer Army lies beyond the Army itself. I'm talking about the public support. We need your help as we plow new ground, as we steer an uncharted course to give the country the best Army it has ever had. Without your help, we cannot succeed; with it, we cannot fail. Together, we can meet the challenges and prove worthy of the Nation's trust.

Thank you.

LEGAL SERVICES OUTRAGE

HON. ROBERT E. BAUMAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 24, 1973

Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Speaker, in the very near future, this House will be taking up consideration of the Legal Services Corporation bill once again. The bill drawn up by the Senate differs considerably from the version passed by the House, and would, in my opinion, have disastrous effects on the country. No one knows better the vast potential for abuse in an independent Legal Services Corporation than the former Director of OEO, Howard Phillips. In a front page article in a recent issue of *Human Events*, the conservative Washington weekly, Mr. Phillips details the twisted road the bill has taken here on the Hill, and offers a warning about the consequences of enacting legislation without the minimal safeguards provided in a number of amendments passed here in the House in June.

Mr. Phillips also details the role which the White House could play, if it were of such a mind. I sincerely hope that the President takes note of the entreaty of the man he appointed to oversee the phasing out of the Office of Economic Opportunity, and I present Mr. Phillips' article here for the Members' consideration:

SENATE VOTE NEARS—WILL NIXON SWALLOW
LEGAL SERVICES OUTRAGE?

(By Howard Phillips)

The moment of truth is close at hand in which will be resolved one of the most critical, yet least debated, domestic policy issues of the past decade: Legal Services. To a very great extent the outcome will be shaped by the attitude of Richard Nixon and those he has named to man his White House staff.

No activity of the federal government in the modern political era has had a more revolutionary impact on our society than legal services. In terms of leftist organizational success, high-impact radical propagandizing, pervasive administrative and legislative lobbying, landmark test case litigation, provision of patronage to the McGovern Democratic left, and countless other ways, the legal services program has become the state-subsidized theocracy of America's Liberal Establishment. It is the "establishment of religion," albeit a secular religion, against

which James Madison and other libertarians warned us in the context of an earlier era. It is the extra-procedural instrument by which a militant left-wing political minority wields power, subsidized by the taxes of the American people.

While Nixon spokesmen irrelevantly denounce "acid, amnesty and abortion," legal services attorneys are quietly at work using Nixon Administration funds to promote liberalized drug policies, abortion on demand, and assistance to military dissenters.

While the President's legislative representatives lobby for the Alaska pipeline, legal services activists have played a leading role in delaying it. While Nixon opposes forced busing, legal services promotes it. While the President lectures about the work ethic and workfare, legal services leads the legislative strategy and grass-roots lobby for "welfare rights."

With funds, not just from the Office of Economic Opportunity, but the Departments of Health, Education and Welfare, Housing and Urban Development and the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration and other agencies as well, they have made their presence felt at San Quentin, in the front line of the anti-war movement, in Cesar Chavez' strategy meetings, in organizing for the American Indian Movement, in rent strikes, in underground newspapers, in marches against the President; they have become the vanguard of the "proletariat" which they have helped create.

Now the issue is coming to a head.

Operating in closed meetings, without yet having afforded any opportunity for public hearings, the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare rushed this past week to mark up and send to the floor a heavily liberalized version of the proposal for a non-accountable Legal Services Corporation.

If the Senate committee has its way, the present legal services program would be locked into place without any of the procedural safeguards adopted by the House of Representatives in June, and minus the organizational accountability to the Congress and the President which are now available to curb abuses.

Critics of the OEO legal services program have pointed out that, under a centralized national corporation, with virtually all decisions made in Washington, rather than in the localities where the program operates, it has been relatively easy for a small clique to exercise undue influence over legal services policies and funding decisions.

Furthermore, legal services attorneys, compensated by salary, rather than fee, have found themselves much freer than attorneys in private practice to devote their energies to personal political priorities, rather than simply to respond to client needs. As a consequence of the monopoly staff system, which excludes reliance on private practitioners, clients are unable to be assured of assistance, let alone the choice of their own attorney. It is the salaried attorney who decides which clients and what causes shall gain attention.

Because current legal services policies have encouraged group representation, political organizing, legislative lobbying, propagandizing of the poor with radical social doctrines, and related activities, the House on June 21, adopted more than a score of amendments to limit such misdirection of resources. Without these restrictions, which are by no means comprehensive or fully adequate, present program outrages would be locked in and exacerbated, beyond the reach of accountability to elected officials.

Now, according to Senate insiders, the liberal committee has determined not only to emasculate the safeguards adopted by the House, but also to make the bill even weaker than the watered-down compromise introduced by the Administration in May.

The Labor and Public Welfare Committee, which is dominated by such prominent lib-

eral senators, as Edward M. Kennedy (D.-Mass.), Walter Mondale (D.-Minn.), Thomas Eagleton (D.-Mo.), Gaylord Nelson (D.-Wis.), and William Hathaway (D.-Maine), relies for its GOP leadership on ranking Republican Jacob Javits—who, more often than not, is merely an extension of the Democratic leadership. Giving support to Javits on the Republican side are J. Glenn Beall (Md.), (brother of Vice President Agnew's prosecutor. Maryland U.S. Attorney George Beall), Richard Schweiker (Pa.), Robert Stafford (Vt.) and Robert Taft (Ohio).

Other liberal Democrats on the committee includes Chairman Harrison Williams (N.J.), Harold Hughes (Iowa), Alan Cranston (Calif.) and Claiborne Pell (R.I.).

Subcommittee action on the corporation bill was completed on October 2 and 3. Prodded by Senators Javits and Kennedy, ratification by the full committee and subsequent referral to the Senate floor was expected to have been completed within a few days thereafter.

Contrary to the assumption of those observers who have relied on Washington newspaper accounts for information about the legal services controversy, the Labor and Public Welfare Committee has not acted on the legal services bill which was adopted by the House on June 21. That bill has been sidetracked by the Democratic leadership of the Senate which has been heavily lobbied by politically oriented legal services grantees to start "from scratch" with a more permissive bill, free of restrictions on their activities.

It has been the equally significant objective of the program's attorney beneficiaries to deny jurisdiction over the proposed corporation to the relatively moderate Senate Judiciary Committee, which would normally have jurisdiction over legal services legislation and power of review over presidential appointments to the prospective corporation's Board of Directors.

The Standing Rules of the Senate state that the committee on the Judiciary shall have referred to it "all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials and other matters related to . . . judicial proceedings, civil and criminal. . . ." (emphasis added.) Nothing in the rules would even seem to suggest Labor and Public Welfare's claim to authority over the legal services program, once it is separated from OEO.

But the legal services lobby has so far succeeded on both fronts, blocking the House bill and Judiciary jurisdiction.

When the House-passed bill reached the Senate, an attempt was made by liberals to refer it inconspicuously to the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. This tactic failed when Michigan Sen. Robert Griffin questioned it, inquiring whether the Judiciary Committee might not more properly receive the referral. Fearing an adverse parliamentary ruling, liberal senators decided to let the House bill "be held at the desk of the Senate," a procedural move to avoid a clear showdown on the Judiciary issue at this time. This left them free to proceed with a "clean" bill in Labor and Public Welfare.

In a related action, when the Brock-Helms proposal for a client-oriented, decentralized legal services program was referred to Judiciary, liberal staffers arranged to keep it bottled up, without hearings, in a new subcommittee headed by California Sen. John V. Tunney, the former roommate of Ted Kennedy, who received strong support from legal services employees when he defeated George Murphy in 1970.

The importance of the jurisdictional question is particularly evident given the history of recent months: In order to gain Labor and Public Welfare Committee approval of his appointment as OEO director, Alvin Arnett, who had been my principal administrative officer during the period in which I headed OEO, found it necessary to repudiate all his previous activities, not just terms of rhet-

oric, but with respect to specific policy and funding decisions. He, in effect, surrendered control over the agency's management to the super-liberal committee, in return for a \$42,500 salary and a chauffeured limousine.

Even if the President appoints men and women of stronger character than Arnett to the board of the corporation, they will become subject to persistent pressures from Javits and his colleagues to surrender key principles as a condition of Senate approval. Although Judiciary jurisdiction would not, of itself, assure immunity from prosecution, it would go a long way toward removing the legal services program from the clutches of an exclusive liberal clique and enhancing the prospect of independent governance for the new corporation.

Leading the fight for a radicalized version of the corporation proposal has been the rabidly anti-Nixon American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU), whose leaders have been plotting the impeachment of Richard Nixon in close cooperation with legal services activists. In fact, one of OEO's legal services back-up centers was founded by Father Robert Drinan, the congressman from Massachusetts who introduced the first impeachment resolution against Nixon. While dean of the Boston College Law School, Drinan played a key role in organizing the OEO-funded National Consumer Law Center, which bears the mark of his influence even today.

Despite ACLU's activities, ironically, the present advantage which Senate liberals enjoy in their legal services strategy and negotiations with the White House derives in large part from the fact that President Nixon now seems more interested in getting the corporation quickly passed and operational than do the radical forces which will benefit most from its enactment. As a consequence, Senate liberals feel encouraged to hold out for the best deal they can get on the corporation bill's provisions.

Liberal staff members of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee also reportedly plan to delay confirmation of corporation board members until they get appointees from the White House who will, for the most part, serve the present program's policies and grantees intact.

A major consideration in taking the pressure for a corporation off the liberals is their present control of the legal services program at OEO. The office has not had a designated director since early July. Day-to-day direction is now under the guidance of Dan Bradley, a protégé of Watergate Committee Assistant Counsel Terry Lenzner. As a special assistant to Arnett, Bradley runs the show, with Frank Duggan, a left-wing Texas Democrat serving as operation chief. An ally of former Sen. Ralph Yarborough, Duggan was a bitter foe of both John Connally and John Tower while working with the AFL-CIO Committee on Political Education (COPE). Bradley and Duggan are busy "staffing up" their offices with like-minded colleagues, preparing for the corporation.

With Arnett's concurrence, legal services program guidelines and administration have reverted to the kind of permissive disregard of the law which characterized earlier periods of liberal program domination. Program funds are once again disbursed "among friends" at the whim of the leftist clique which dominates the program nationwide. In the short run, at least, program attorneys could hardly do better under a corporation. So they've decided to "up the ante" and see how many more concessions will be granted by eager White House staffers.

As senate liberals negotiate with Jim Cavanaugh, assistant director of the Domestic Council, the legal services lobby is helped by an incredibly foolish White House strategy which seeks a corporation at any cost.

Led by Office of Management and Budget Assistant Director Paul O'Neill, management-budget officials have been hard at work since November 1972 to "protect" President Nixon

from his original determination to eliminate, not merely cover up, destructive and unproductive OEO activities.

Instead of cutting out bad grants and changing unwise policies, their objective has been to reduce "political flak" by shifting OEO components, unchanged, to new bureaucratic homes. They hoped to appease conservatives with the appearance of change, while keeping liberals happy with increased funding levels and the "institutionalization" elsewhere of OEO-initiated activities.

It is O'Neill's current tactic, adopted by Arnett and Cavanaugh, to whom Arnett reports, to insist that unless corporation legislation is swiftly passed and a board of directors is promptly confirmed, OEO, against the President's wishes, would have to continue. This isn't true, and the argument better serves the goals of the ACLU—which hopes to rush a legal services program into existence—than it does Richard Nixon. Despite O'Neill, OEO can be eliminated as an operational institution whenever the White House decides to veto further appropriations for its activities.

No matter what the President does, ACLU will still dislike him. His policies should be accountable not to legal services liberals, but to those who supported his re-election. Conservatives are tired of the cosmetic rhetoric reflected in the "corporation at any cost" strategy and anxious to see if real reform of anti-poverty programs is on the President's agenda.

Another flaw in the present Administration thinking can be seen in the notion that specific provisions in the legal services bill are unimportant, so long as the President has sole power to appoint its national board of directors. This OMB-promoted view is arrogant, ignorant and short-sighted. Even if Richard Nixon's leadership were provably infallible, it must be borne in mind that he will not always be President. Congress was created by the founding fathers to help assure that we would have a government of laws, to transcend the sway of any individual. Congress writes laws to provide us with safeguards against human imperfection in circumstances we cannot always foresee. These safeguards are especially needed in a corporation removed from both presidential and congressional control, with board members little more accountable than justices of the Supreme Court. Because legislated safeguards are absent from the present program and because the White House has sought to avoid criticism from the left through a policy of administrative neglect, legal services is presently excessively characterized by abuse.

If it is bad now, without safeguards, while theoretically accountable to the President directly, might things not get worse under an independent corporation? Would not responsible governance in the absence of statutory safeguards be even less likely under boards named by a President Mondale or President Kennedy?

ACLU has taken notice of the White House's apparent retreat from earlier positions and interpreted this as a sign of continuing decline in President Nixon's political strength.

In a September 21 Legislative Memorandum ACLU urged its allies to raise their demands: "... [W]e have every right to insist on Senate passage of an uncompromisingly strong bill. Ironically, the Watergate scandal seems to be helping this effort... there should be far less negative pressure coming from the White House than there was last spring. And it is all the more possible for the Senate to pass a strong bill."

ACLU is being joined in its effort to prove the emasculation of Richard Nixon by a wide range of liberals who support the "Action for Legal Rights" legal services lobby. These include Clinton Bamberger, John W. Douglas, Jacob Fuchsberg, Roswell Gilpatric, Arthur J. Goldberg, Terry Lenzner, Sargent Shriver and Cyrus Vance. With a staff operation led

by California Rural Legal Assistance veteran Mickey Bennett and former OEO Migrant chief Noel Klores, they have received important covert assistance from White House Counsel Leonard Garment and HEW Under Secretary Frank Carlucci.

If they win, it will only be a result of Richard Nixon's acquiescence. The simple fact is that, through his power of veto, President Nixon can insist on legislation that meets high standards.

Solid commitments and solemn promises were made last spring that the President would veto any bill which was the slightest degree to the left of the compromise version he sent to Congress in May—a draft already dangerously weakened by liberal pressures before it was sent to the Hill.

As part of those commitments and promises, conservatives were encouraged to advance strengthening amendments. The clear, oft-repeated message was "We welcome and will stand by such amendments."

On June 21, the House, though by no means doing a perfect job, did tighten some loopholes.

Now, as is evident to the opposition, White House spokesmen are waffling. The commitments are being conveniently fudged. It is said that the President is tired of the issue and wants to "get it off his back."

A lot of people still have faith that the President, in the final analysis, will use the power of his office to achieve a result consistent with his promises to conservatives. Others believe that Mr. Nixon simply wants to survive in office for the balance of his term and has concluded that, to do so, he must abandon domestic policy-setting to his liberal adversaries, in Congress, and in his own bureaucracy.

For a great many of us, this will be the moment of truth.

NERVE GAS TESTING PLANNED

HON. BELLA S. ABZUG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 24, 1973

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, we are now facing the prospect of open-air testing of deadly nerve gas. Jack Anderson's column of October 22 reports that the Pentagon has not yet decided whether it is necessary but would request permission before testing. I urge my colleagues to refresh their memories on this issue and refuse such permission.

Recently the Pentagon planned to transport this lethal gas by rail from Colorado to Utah. Because of the concern of Representative WAYNE OWENS, hearings were held and the plan was dropped. The Army also announced that a small portion of its Colorado stockpile would be destroyed—a portion already obsolete.

This does not solve the problem of dangerous weapons stored at some seven other points around the country; nor of the dangers ahead in testing the new "binary" weapons. Unfortunately, however, the Army's announcement ended the hearings and conveyed the impression that the problem of chemical weapons was solved. On the contrary, the Pentagon has simply found newer and "better" ways to make and stockpile chemical weapons, which should be totally outlawed.

I was privileged to present this point of view to the House Armed Services

Committee hearings and would like to include that testimony in the RECORD, along with the relevant portion of Jack Anderson's column.

The material follows:

ARMY WEIGHS OPEN-AIR GAS TESTS

(By Jack Anderson)

The Army is considering open-air tests of a deadly new nerve gas, presumably at Utah's Dugway Proving Ground where 6,400 sheep were killed five years ago in similar field tests.

The Army is trying to develop a nerve gas that would be safe to handle. The gas is produced by mixing two chemicals, which can be stored separately with complete safety. They are loaded into a shell, which is exploded over the target. This creates a chemical reaction that causes the deadly gas.

This binary system, as it is called, requires extensive testing. So far, the Army has confined its research to simulated tests. But an Army report states that, if permission can be arranged, "a limited number of open-air tests will be performed."

Alarmed over the possibility these tests may be conducted on the Utah range, Rep. Wayne Owens (D-Utah) has fired off a private letter to Army Secretary Howard Callaway.

"How soon is open-air testing of binaries to begin?" demands Owens. "When will congressional and EPA approval be sought?"

The Army Secretary hasn't replied to Owens, but a Pentagon spokesman told us: "No decision has been made as to whether it will be necessary to do open-air testing. If the decision were made, we would request permission."

The experts agree, however, that final development of the binary system nerve gas would be difficult without open-air tests.

Footnote: President Nixon has outlawed the production of biological but not chemical weapons. Critics of the binary system fear that the terrible nerve gas formula would be easy for small nations to produce. The two elements in the gas are fairly simple to make.

STATEMENT OF BELLA S. ABZUG

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate this opportunity to present my views on the urgent question of chemical weapons.

I welcome the announcement made yesterday by Army Secretary Callaway, that some 500,000 gallons of nerve gas stored at the Rocky Mountain Arsenal will be destroyed. I believe the Secretary is sincere in his wish to dispose of this menace, for he has earlier indicated that he saw no justification for keeping it. Let us hope that he will proceed with dispatch—since for four years now, the Army has promised to dispose of this lethal gas. For all those years, 4600 tons of poisonous gases have been stored within a mile of one of the nation's busiest airports, just outside of Denver. The citizens of the area have been immensely disturbed, as they should be—a plane crash at that location would be catastrophic.

We have lived so long with lethal weapons that we almost take them for granted; yet this situation is truly incredible.

There is enough nerve gas at the Rocky Mountain Arsenal to wipe out every human being on this earth, several times over. A drop of GB the size of a pin-head can kill a person in ten minutes. Yet the stuff is stored in steel containers, above ground, a mile from an airport.

Recently the Army proposed to move some of it to another depot in Utah (where a huge amount of chemical agents is already stored). This proposal too was fraught with danger. In the last few years we have seen many instances of citizens evacuated from their homes because of derailments or explosions of ammunition trains. In 1968 there were over 8000 railroad accidents in the United

States. The Army has no right, now or ever, to subject citizens to such hazards.

I confess that I am skeptical about the content of the Secretary's announcement, however. There are eight locations in the country at which nerve gas is stored. Apparently it is not to be destroyed. Further, the attitude of the Department of Defense and the Administration is elusive.

You have heard the testimony of Rep. Wayne Owens, whose bill is being considered here. When he attempted to get information on the need for chemical weapons in modern defense strategy, he received full cooperation from the CIA and the Arms Control Agency; but from the Department of Defense he met "an absolute refusal to discuss the issue at all—even to allow lower level staff people to brief me." Such was the reception accorded the Representative whose District is vitally affected by these weapons.

As you are well aware, the United States has not yet signed the Geneva Protocol of 1925, outlawing poisonous or asphyxiating gases and bacteriological warfare. During the war in Vietnam, the Administration wanted to continue using chemical herbicides. Now that the hated war is ended, that rationale is removed, and the nation should move at once to join over 100 other countries, including all the big powers, who have ratified the Protocol. But the Chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee has not yet received a reply from Mr. Nixon, to his letter of April 15, 1971, raising questions about the Protocol.

Mr. Owens' bill, H.R. 9745, calls for a re-evaluation of the United States policy of stockpiling chemical nerve agents. I believe that this must be done—but that the Congress and not the Administration must make such a review.

The Army's announcement does not obviate the need for legislation to control the manufacture, use, storage and disposition of chemical weapons. I commend the intent of Mr. Owens' bill, but I fear that in actuality it would permit, rather than prevent, transportation of nerve gas. Its stated purpose is "to insure that no public funds be used for the purpose of transporting chemical nerve agents to or from any military installation in the United States for storage or stockpiling purposes unless it is the sense of the Congress to do so," but three conditions would nullify this effect. Transportation is prohibited unless

(1) the President has made known to Congress his position on the status of herbicides and tear gas under the Geneva Protocol of 1925;

(2) the President has provided Congress with a reevaluation of the necessity for the US policy of stockpiling chemical nerve agents and

(3) the President has certified to the Armed Services Committee of Congress that such transportation is necessary in the interest of national security and that its disposal by detoxification would be seriously detrimental to the chemical weapon deterrent capability of the United States.

"National security" as we have recently discovered, can cover a multitude of sins. The President could easily certify to the necessity of moving and storing gas for "national security" reasons, and no one could verify his statement.

It seems to me that we must provide a broader legislative mandate. Senator Floyd Haskell has called for a nine-month study to determine the best and safest method of eliminating all existing supplies of chemical warfare agents, the cost and time necessary to carry out such a program and the manner in which such a program should proceed. He believes, as I do, that our entire stockpile of chemical agents should be destroyed.

It is terrifying enough that our nuclear over-kill is in the nature of 10 to one: that

is, we are able to kill every person on earth ten times over. Must we cling to this stockpile of chemical overkill also? In the nuclear age it is obsolete since it cannot be safely transported. Representative Frank Evans of Colorado has correctly stated that "the supreme irony of our chemical nerve agents is that they pose the greatest danger to our own people."

There is no justification to continue to store this horrendous materiel anywhere in this country or in the world. We have already rejected a first-use of it; and the thought that its existence would deter nuclear attack is illogical on its face. The danger, again, is to our own people.

Further, as Mr. Owens has pointed out, our refusal to destroy this stockpile encourages smaller nations to develop and maintain chemical weapons, which are so much easier to develop than a nuclear capability. Certainly it does nothing to promote a climate of international trust.

I am not reassured by the Army's announcement that it now plans binary munitions production—in which two ingredients are stored separately and not combined until the munition is ready for firing. The proliferation of such techniques would make it easier for small countries—even for terrorist and dissident groups—to obtain life-obliterating weapons. It would still leave the problem of open-air testing, already scheduled for the Dugway Proving Ground. A few years ago, open air testing at Dugway resulted in the death of 6400 sheep; next time, it could be people.

Apparently the Department of Defense is trying to take back with one hand what it gives with the other. If under public pressure it is compelled to destroy existing stockpiles of chemical weapons, it will start their immediate replacement with binary weapons. Meanwhile, we retain an offensive chemical capacity, and continue research on new toxic agents.

It is time—indeed it is already past time—that the Congress review the entire function of chemical warfare. I am convinced that it will be found useless, costly and so hazardous that no more time must be lost in deactivating such weapons.

AIDING GRADUATE STUDENTS

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 24, 1973

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, as our Nation very properly gives its attention to the worsening energy crisis, a medical educator from Buffalo, N.Y., has issued a terse warning that our resources of "mind power" also are not endless.

During a Buffalo town meeting last week, Dr. M. J. Smith, assistant director of education at Roswell Park Memorial Institute, expressed concern for the national policy phasing out training of biomedical personnel.

Dr. Smith explains carefully why she feels it is a mistake to replace fellowships and training grants as the basic system of supporting research students.

Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks, I include the text of Dr. Smith's presentation:

REMARKS OF DR. M. J. SMITH

Today, we are all well aware of the potential damage to our nation that develops when our natural resources are taken for granted.

However, it would appear that we do not learn from our mistakes.

We are here this afternoon not to remind you that our resources are in jeopardy but to speak of the imminent stifling of our most precious resource—"our mind power". It has to become clear that "a mind is a terrible thing to waste".

We need these minds to solve the energy crisis we are facing as well as a human crisis in terms of biomedical research with which we at Roswell Park Memorial Institute are so absorbingly involved.

The Federal administration has taken the position that the "need for greater numbers of biomedical personnel has passed", and that the supply of researchers will soon exceed the demand. Furthermore, they argue that this oversupply will lead to a situation of unemployment.

DISPUTE ON FEDERAL FACTS

These arguments are not consistent with the projections of the NIH reports that state that by 1983 we will need 112,360 biomedical scientists as compared to 66,800 in 1961. Accordingly, we question the justification for phasing out of training program at all levels and particularly for our young, gifted, potential biomedical personnel.

Also, this has been questioned rigorously by other representatives of the biomedical community to the point of causing the administration to revise its decision by promising a token \$30 million for only restoring a training program that will be predominantly for post doctorates.

HEW promised that by October 1 the new rules governing the \$30 million post doctoral fellowship program would be forthcoming. However, today is October 15 and we are still waiting to see these new guidelines which are being held up because of lack of agreement on pay-back provision and the manner of selecting participants.

BIOMED SURPLUS QUESTIONED

The President's Science Advisory Committee has stated that "the implication that we are training a surplus of biomedical Ph. D.'s appears unfounded. All but 1.3% of those Ph. D.'s graduated in 1968-69 found positions in which they are expertly utilizing their graduate education."

Furthermore, we must realize that with every new advance made, a broad range of research opportunities is created expanding the potential job market. The new proposed system of supporting students through investigators with research contracts and grants as an alternative to fellowships and training grants has been described.

We consider this system inadequate first because it tends to restrict students to specific projects and forces students to work only with professors having such money. An organization could not develop a dependable, identifiable training program of excellence using a research project grant technique.

BREAKDOWN OF TRAINING AIMS

We have had experience with this approach and it leads to a breakdown of training objectives. Moreover, it perpetuates the training of individuals in those departments rich in research grants and therefore does not assure training in critical areas of professional and supportive personnel needs in research areas, be it in cancer or in the area of supplying energy.

The objectives of a training grant and that of a research project grant are different. The trainee is forced to limit his thinking to the objectives of the investigator's grant rather than training himself to being an excellent researcher. He is forced to play the role of a technician.

INCREASE COSTS OF GRANTS

Secondly, this would increase the costs of a research grant inasmuch as we would have to pay salaries which are higher than stipends. If you did this, staff members or de-

partments could only support a small number of employees at the expense of ongoing research effort.

We would recommend that:

1. NIH training grants be continued and even expended to meet shortages in personnel in the pre and post doctoral basic and clinical disciplines that provide research and service.

2. NIH training grants be continued and expanded for supportive personnel that provide service and research in areas where there are identifiable shortages.

3. Such training functions be conducted primarily at centers that are equipped to train professional and supportive personnel in basic and clinical areas.

4. NIH make a strong defense against using research project grants to support trainees because it is not reliable fiscally and does not assure excellence in training since it would not be consistent with the objectives of the research project grant and would not assure the training of personnel in critical areas.

RISK OF OVER-EXPECTATIONS

One of our greatest concerns is the risk of inordinately high expectations on the part of the Congress and the public. We must not think of this program as comparable to a moon shot or an atom bomb program. It cannot be regarded as a crash program for the accelerated implementation of known basic science.

Instead, this is a program in basic science matched with the endeavor to bring the best of today's science to solve crucial problems. We are not in search of a magic bullet, but rather are attempting to mobilize the best brains available in this nation and the world to insure that they have an opportunity to make their maximum contribution to the cause of solving problems and of minimizing the time required for the solutions to benefit the people of the world.

CORPORATE RESPONSIBILITY

HON. PETER A. PEYSER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 24, 1973

Mr. PEYSER. Mr. Speaker, I was shocked and disappointed to see a recent statement by the former Deputy Secretary of Defense, and the present chairman of the board of the Hewlett Co., Mr. David Packard, in which he called for a curtailment of corporate support for higher education. Mr. Packard, at a luncheon sponsored by the Committee for Corporate Support of American Universities, not only called upon corporations to withhold their support from American colleges and universities, but also asked these same corporations to restrict any money that they do give to specific projects.

I am frankly amazed that someone with the background and long-term involvement in national affairs that Mr. Packard has would call for corporations to curtail contributions at a time of financial crisis for colleges and universities.

Anyone who has had an involvement with the problems of higher educational institutions knows the financial problems which these institutions now face. They also know the problems that restricted gifts necessarily create, although they are better than no contribution at all.

My belief, which has been shared by corporations for a good many years, is that corporations have a moral obligation to help colleges and universities when it is economically possible. At this time, the Government recognizing the financial plight of colleges and universities is seeking ways, not only to increase aid for needy students, but to give institutional aid to institutions of higher education throughout the country.

Mr. Packard's statements are clearly insensitive to the needs of our young people and to our colleges and universities across the country. His proposal runs counter to our governmental efforts in this area, and if adopted by the corporate community, could effectively reduce all forms of individual and corporate contributions. If we were to follow his theory through, I can see where perhaps only five or six major universities would receive aid. For instance, a great many corporations would believe that their money would yield the greatest benefit to them by investing it in specific programs at Harvard, MIT, Stanford, and the like, and then recruiting those program graduates for their corporations.

While I have nothing but respect for these universities, smaller and less well known schools also contribute greatly to the country and to the corporate community. They should in no way be ignored. They supply corporate leaders, and community leaders who interrelate to corporations.

It is estimated that at the present time, corporations give less than 1 percent of their pre-tax earnings to colleges and universities. Surely this is not a level that should be reduced. In recent years, many corporations have developed a program of raising dollar for dollar any gifts made to colleges and universities by their employees. The Packard proposal could place this program, which is proving to be very successful, in great jeopardy.

The Packard proposal would academically and financially bankrupt our colleges. He has obviously flunked his course in corporate responsibility for academic institutions, and I urge the corporate community to reject his suggestions.

USA IN MINIATURE

HON. STANFORD E. PARRIS

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 24, 1973

Mr. PARRIS. Mr. Speaker, my constituent, Mr. John R. Kanline, of Alexandria, Va., has been diligently attempting for some time to gain the approval and assistance of the Federal Government, U.S. industry, and the general public for a project entitled "U.S.A. in Miniature," to be completed in time for the 1976 Bicentennial celebration.

On August 3, 1973, I included Mr. Kanline's letter to the editor of the Washington Star-News in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. As a follow-up on this subject, Mr. Kanline has provided me, in letter form, with an "action outline" for the implementation of this proposal. At this time, under my leave to revise

and extend my remarks, I include that letter in the RECORD:

SEPTEMBER 28, 1973.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PARRIS: I appreciate your remarks on the proposal inserted in the August 3, 1973, Congressional Record and would like to add this to your "thoughts on the Bicentennial." The idea, you recall, is to create a small park in the National Capital area depicting the major sights of the U.S.A. in miniature as a major feature of the Bicentennial in 1976, and patterned after a similar park in the Netherlands called "Modurodam."

Modurodam is four acres in size with walkways interspersing the miniaturization of historical and modern features of the Netherlands with 44,000 lights, 2 miles of miniature operating railroad, shipping ports, windmills, oil refineries, manufacturing plants, etc. This park has operated for fifteen years at a profit.

To create a similar U.S. feature in time for the 1976 Bicentennial would require the interest and support of a number of segments of the U.S. such as government, general public, industry, agriculture and most of all the Bicentennial Commission and the media. I therefore suggest the following action outline for consideration of those who may see this:

(1) Government support in promoting and checking the feasibility of the proposal, including the Smithsonian, the Bicentennial Commission, the Park Service, the tourist section of the Department of Commerce, etc.;

(2) Individual and collective action of the Congress in suggesting to the Commission special features and sights from their constituencies for inclusion in this unique national park;

(3) The most necessary support of industry to participate in the technical creation of manufacturing plants in miniature such as steel mills, refineries, railroads, shipping ports, etc., and to help also by having certain segments of industry help finance parts of the project. This would constitute an excellent form of advertising;

(4) Historians, architectural designers and the Smithsonian to suggest historical topics for inclusion and to insure authenticity with financial help from philanthropic organizations;

(5) News media interest and support to editorialize the foregoing and help in its promotion in order to build up general public support. Their articles could be based on the letters to the Editor in both local papers and your article in the August 3, 1973, Congressional Record;

(6) The needed support of local citizens for the proposal and to make such support known to the Bicentennial Commission so this project can become a reality;

(7) Local government interest in a suitable location.

Since my earlier letter I have learned that several parties already have designs and cost estimates in hand for consideration.

I have also contacted steel companies, automobile manufacturers, insurance companies, refining companies, food manufacturers, camera and film producers, national associations of soft drink and beverage companies, and for the most part the response was enthusiastic after local representatives had passed the contents of your "Thoughts on the Bicentennial" on to their home offices.

My interest in this is non-monetary and stems from a visit my wife and I took to Modurodam several years ago.

With the vast resources of this nation, I cannot see why "U.S.A. in Miniature" cannot be created for the Bicentennial and its 40 million visitors to this area, as well as for the local children and adults who would find it both entertaining and educational.

JOHN R. KANLINE.

CHARLES T. BUSH, PATUXENT NAVY MAN OF THE YEAR

HON. ROBERT E. BAUMAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 24, 1973

Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Speaker, in these days of volunteer military service it is well for the Congress to recognize those who are willing to work in their capacity as members of the military and the naval forces. It has come to my attention that PNI Charles T. Bush has been chosen by the Navy League to be the Patuxent Navy Man of the Year. Chief Bush's reputation at the Patuxent Naval Air Test Center, Md., where he is stationed, is one of the highest order. He has not only been very active in his own profession achieving an excellent rating, but he has also been a model member of the community in which he lives as well as a leading layman in his church.

Mr. Speaker, these are the kind of men who our Armed Forces need, and I am happy to bring to the attention of the House the outstanding record of this young man. I include at this point in my remarks an article from the Guardian of Lexington Park, Md., regarding PNI Charles T. Bush:

PATUXENT NAVY MAN OF THE YEAR

A dynamic young petty officer in Oceanographic Development Squadron Eight has been named Patuxent Navy Man of the Year for 1973. He is PNI Charles T. Bush, 28 career counselor and personnel office supervisor in VXN-8.

PNI Bush was selected from five nominees by a panel of representatives from the Naval Air Test Center, Naval Air Station and Fleet.

He will be presented a plaque and cash award by Mr. R. F. Gabrelcik, president of the Patuxent River Council of the Navy League, in ceremonies commemorating the Navy's 198th birthday on Oct. 13 at the Petty Officers Club. Witnessing the presentation will be RADM. Roy M. Isaman, NATO commander; Capt. T. J. Kilcline, NAS commanding officer; and Cdr. R. L. Barr, VXN-8 commanding officer.

Honored as Navy Man of the year in his squadron in 1972 and 1973, PNI Bush was a runner-up for the Patuxent River award last year. He also was nominated for the Navy League's Admiral Claude V. Ricketts Award in 1972.

PNI Bush has been assigned to VXN-8 almost four of his seven years in the Navy.

He gained attention up the Navy chain of command earlier this year when he conceived and organized a coast-to-coast recruiting flight for a project airplane assigned to the squadron.

During one weekend between deployments, the Project Magnet visited Modesto, Calif.; St. Louis, Mo.; Oklahoma City, Okla.; and Groton, Conn. Advance contact with Navy recruiting officers in those cities resulted in 2,500 persons being exposed to the Navy and its unique project to measure the earth's magnetic field.

PNI Bush organized a career development program which has boosted VXN-8's retention of first-term reenlistments to an average of 49 per cent. This figure compares to the Fleet norm of about 18 per cent.

PNI Bush also created a Personnel Quality Control Board which aids division officers by identifying individuals who require specific training. The board also screens marginal performers.

The Patuxent Navy Man of the Year is ac-

tive in the church, serving as an Eucharistic Minister, the highest rank a layman can attain. He has served as vice president and as chairman of the Liturgy Committee of the Patuxent River Catholic Parish Council.

PNI Bush is a native of Baltimore.

He and his wife Joyce and three children, Tommy, 4; Gregory, 2; and Jennifer, two months, live aboard the station.

THE URGENT NEED TO DEVELOP SOLAR ENERGY

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 24, 1973

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, with the outbreak of yet another Middle East war our domestic energy crisis has been thrown into the chaotic turmoil of international politics. On Wednesday of last week ministers from 11 Arab oil states agreed to restrict exports to the United States. This restriction is to be progressive: Five percent reductions each month until the pre-1967 boundaries are re-established and "the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people are restored."

On Sunday it was announced that the Arab States had rejected this plan as too moderate and decided instead on a total boycott of American markets. Whatever the scheme, the intent is clear: It is political blackmail, clear and simple.

We will undoubtedly weather this crisis. Only about 10 percent of our total crude oil consumption of 17 million barrels a day comes from the Middle Eastern sources. Deputy Secretary of Treasury William Simon has already outlined steps that consumers and industry can take to cut our consumption by as much as 3 million barrels a day. There is good reason to believe that these conservation strategies—such as turning down thermostats and cold water clothes washing—can be successful in limiting our immediate dependence on Arab oil.

The major failing of these proposals is that they are highly individual actions. They depend for their success on the almost instantaneous development of a "conservation ethic" among consumers and industry. I am confident that Americans can meet this challenge. But I am concerned that we may be shortsighted in not understanding the vast dimensions of our oil shortage problem. The fact is that with present consumption trends, we will become increasingly dependent on Arab oil. The small conservation steps Mr. Simon suggests we take today will be no insurance for our security tomorrow.

We are all aware that the equation of declining domestic production and booming consumer demand adds up to our further dependence on foreign sources of petroleum. The National Petroleum Council, in projecting petroleum imports from all sources, estimates that by 1985, 57 percent of our total petroleum demand will be made up by imports.

The Middle East States are in the best position to supply this need. They are sitting on the largest known pools of oil in the world—over 67 percent of proven crude oil resources.

In today's unstable world, this overwhelming dependence on outside sources for petroleum imposes on our national security a serious vulnerability. Quoting from a study of the Senate Interior Committee:

The growing proportion of total U.S. energy supply coming from foreign sources, or from particular regions, blocs or countries magnifies the potential impact on the U.S. economy from a variety of contingencies including wars or international political confrontations and insurrection or sabotage in producing regions.

An equally serious eventuality—because it is certain to occur—is the net outflow of capital from the United States to oil producers. In this development there are two impacts that must be considered. The first is the ability of the U.S. economy to support this massive outflow of capital. Estimates of the impact of this outflow vary widely, but it is certain to reach the neighborhood of \$10 billion annually by 1980. While there is good reason to hope that the economy will support an outflow of this size without seriously threatening the dollar by expanding our own exports, there is little reason for optimism.

Most of the dollars flowing out of the United States will end up in the treasuries of small countries with a narrow economic base. Ordinarily, we could expect revenues from international trade to find their way to more populous countries with diverse economies. In this situation the dollars would be absorbed in the economic system without serious disruptions to world monetary flows. Unfortunately, the Arab countries are undiversified economies; there is oil production and little else. There are no wide-scale social programs and little incentive to develop other sectors of their economies. As the result, the governments of these countries have been able to accumulate enormous liquid monetary balances.

To quote again from the Senate Interior Committee report:

By the 1980s the total incomes of the Middle Eastern and North African producing nations will reach many billions of dollars per year and their balances could cumulate to hundreds of billions.

Last winter, we had a brief look into the chaos these large sums of dollars can bring. By dumping these reserves on the world market Arab governments not only can aggravate the instability of international money markets but also can actually precipitate a crisis in the shaky system of international currency flows. In short, the Arab nations hold much more than oil. With these cash reserves they are in a position to gain an unparalleled position of power in the international economic system.

The conclusion of these ominous projections is that the United States must take steps now—today—to insure our future security by:

First, initiating immediately a Manhattan project for energy research and development, and

Second, limit our overdependence on petroleum by increasing the efficiency with which we consume it.

What is the Nixon administration doing to meet this challenge? After months

of procrastination the administration's energy message was a remarkably low voltage document. The apparent Presidential strategy is to press for increased domestic production through the construction of the Alaskan pipeline, expanded leasing on the Outer Continental Shelf and increased tax incentives for drilling—while promoting a blind faith in nuclear power development. Quite simply, the President's program is narrow and shortsighted. There is no significant mention of energy conservation. There is no significant mention of solar energy. There is no consideration whatsoever of the environmental consequences of increased domestic energy consumption and production. And what is perhaps most worrisome of all, there is no evidence that the President comprehends the immense hazards—to the public health and the national security—of a headlong plunge to nuclear energy.

Planning for our energy future involves sophisticated and complex matters of policy. We cannot expect an administration which took 5 months to decide on a mandatory allocation plan to have much foresight in projecting our Nation's future energy needs. To provide another approach, I have introduced legislation to establish a massive, national program of energy research and development. This research will be funded by a \$4 billion trust fund created through a tax on energy usage. An independent Commission will develop an overall energy strategy and fund research into technologies which offer the hope of clean, safe, and secure energy sources for the future. I would like to turn now to one of these alternatives—solar energy—in order to illustrate more completely the shallow, parochial nature of the Nixon energy program.

The President has announced—with apparent pride—that the National Science Foundation budget for solar research has been increased from a little over \$3 million in fiscal year 1973 to over \$12 million in fiscal year 1974. This is not so much a glorious victory for the advocates of solar energy as an admission of serious underfunding in past budgets.

The primary responsibility for solar research exists with the National Science Foundation, although some work is being done by the Atomic Energy Commission, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the Department of Housing and Urban Development, and the National Bureau of Standards of the Commerce Department. This diffusion of responsibility is largely a product of the low priority that has been assessed historically to solar research. There has been no established national priorities or goals. As a result, research has been geared to solve specific technical problems with little comprehension of the overall potential of solar research. By injecting more money into this research network, the Nixon administration has done little to solve the organizational and administrative obstacles to wide-scale adoption of realistic solar energy technology.

Basically, solar energy has three potential applications. The first is meeting the heating and cooling demands of residential and commercial buildings. The

second is the generation of electricity. The third is the production of "clean" fuels such as methane through the conversion of organic solids. Because solar energy is a diffuse source of energy, conversion of the sun's radiation—to thermal, electrical, or chemical energy—suffers from unusually low efficiency levels. But in the heating and cooling of buildings, solar energy has found a perfect application. In fact, the technology for accomplishing this task is already at hand. What is needed is a coherent, national program to bring this technology out of the laboratory and to the stage of commercial development.

Significant strides have been taken already to this goal. Aside from numerous residential homes which depend on the sun for a significant portion of their energy requirements, a number of office buildings are now being designed and built to include solar space conditioning. The General Services Administration is planning two such buildings: One in Manchester, N.H.; the second in Saginaw, Mich. In addition the Massachusetts Audubon Society will build a solar office building in Lincoln, Mass., soon. Undoubtedly solar buildings will become increasingly popular as people begin to realize the long-run economic advantages of this design.

What is lacking in these efforts is a sense of urgency and national commitment. As we have seen, we can continue our reckless consumption of petroleum only at the peril of our national security. We must begin to move along a number of fronts to restrict our reliance on petroleum. Solar energy presents an obvious starting place.

Accordingly, I have introduced legislation—the Solar Energy Development Act—to publicize and unify the drive toward solar heating and cooling of buildings. This proposal has been sponsored by 39 of my colleagues. By establishing three distinct but interrelated programs, this legislation will move the solar equipment industry off economic dead center. By 1985, 10 percent of all new buildings should be built with solar equipment. In 40 years, 85 percent would be equipped.

Clearly, solar energy is not the only answer to our energy shortages. But there is not going to be any one answer. Any comprehensive energy strategy for the future will be multi-faceted and diverse. In this regard, solar heating and cooling must be considered as one of the most realistic potential alternatives for the future.

Equally as certain is the fact that we as a nation will no longer be able to consume wastefully enormous amounts of energy. The Nixon administration in its energy pronouncements seems to assume our enormous demand for energy is inevitable. Just a cursory examination of our energy consumption pattern reveals clear evidence of widescale inefficiencies. To withstand the trauma of declining domestic production without generating an unstable dependence on foreign sources, we must begin now to "tighten our belts." The obvious place to start is with the gas guzzling American automobiles.

The United States, which contains 5.7

percent of the world's population, owns 46.1 percent of the world's automobiles. There are 97.65 millions cars circulating around our country consuming 73.5 billion gallons of gasoline each year. Seen in this perspective of our total energy budget, the automobile claims 14.3 percent of our energy consumed.

In terms of inefficiency, the automobile is perhaps the most inefficient machine invented by man—and that efficiency has been declining steadily in recent years. Blame for this decline has been shoved on the emission control devices mandated under the Clean Air Act. This blame is misplaced. A much more significant factor is the increased weight of American automobiles, the greater use of optional equipment, and, simply, the reluctance of management in Detroit to design energy efficiency into their automobiles.

To insure that efficiency becomes a serious consideration in the automaker's future plans, I have introduced, with Senator FRANK MOSS, the Fuel Economy Act of 1973. Beginning in model year 1977, this proposal establishes a graduated excise tax on all new cars based on the fuel economy of the vehicle. A car which achieves over 20 miles per gallon pays no tax. As the car's efficiency declines, the tax increases.

Through this tax the consumers of America will be insured of efficient automobiles in the future. In addition this provision will insure a one million barrel a day savings in our Nation's consumption of crude oil.

In the sweep of history, the "Petroleum Age" will be but a small episode in the events of man. It is the moral responsibility of the Federal Government to prepare the American people for the inevitable adjustments ahead. In this critical area, as in many others, the Nixon administration has revealed a bankruptcy of spirit and ideas. Congress must now assume the responsibility and the leadership to guide our Nation to a new and safe energy age.

PABLO CASALS

HON. BELLA S. ABZUG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 24, 1973

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, the death this week of Pablo Casals has taken from the world a great musician and a great humanitarian.

Throughout his long life, Pablo Casals used his great talents to defend the principles of liberty and freedom, unwilling to deny his conscience. Pablo Casals adopted Puerto Rico as his home for the last years of his life, bringing honor to the people of Puerto Rico and the United States.

I am inserting this tribute from the New York Times by Alden Whitman to Pablo Casals into the RECORD to pay homage to a great human being, whose life represents a standard of excellence to all humanitarians and all lovers of music.

The article follows:

[From the New York Times, Oct. 23, 1973]

CASALS, THE MASTER CELLIST, WON WIDE ACCLAIM IN CAREER THAT SPANNED 75 YEARS

(By Alden Whitman)

"I think it goes like this," a cello student struggling with a Johann Sebastian Bach suite once told Pablo Casals.

"Don't think," the master cellist replied. "It is better to feel."

With this emphasis on an inner sensitivity to a composer's intentions, Casals was able to demonstrate what luminescent and human music could be drawn from the strings of a rather awkward instrument. In concerts and recordings over some 75 years, he provoked awe and applause for the profundity of his insights, the felicity of his playing and, above all, the soaring purity of his interpretations of baroque and classical composers. Bach was his specialty, but he was also at home with Boccherini, Mozart, Brahms, Beethoven, Schumann and Dvorak.

At the same time Casals (he pronounced the name KaaSAALS) won much admiration and acclaim as a man of probity and principle for his humanitarianism, his personal musical "crusade for peace" and his one-man stand against the regime of Francisco Franco in his native Spain. Few musicians achieved in their own time the international renown accumulated by Casals.

Part of this fame in the United States at least, came very late in life and rested on Casals' talents in conducting, which he fancied as his real métier and which he had practiced, mainly in Europe, since 1920. Conducting gave him a sense of fulfillment, he said, because orchestras, with their human teamwork, are "the greatest of all instruments."

Early in his career, on his first American tour in 1901, a falling rock crushed the fingers of his left hand. His first thought, as Casals recalled it, was, "Thank God, I won't have to play the cello any more." He associated that reaction with his desire to conduct.

After a period of semiactivity in Europe starting in 1945, Casals went to Puerto Rico to live in 1956. He was then 79 years old and seemed spent. The next year, however, he started the Festival Casals, which became an annual springtime program of concerts. He had a heart attack just before the opening of the first festival, but he recovered buoyantly in the following years, using an orchestra brought together by Alexander Schneider, the violinist and an old friend. The concerts drew thousands of mainlanders to the island and introduced the post-World War II generation of music lovers to Casals.

Then in 1961 he joined Rudolf Serkin's Marlboro Music Festival in Vermont, where each July he conducted the orchestra and gave master classes in the cello. And, beginning in 1962, he conducted a choral work in New York every year. His first presentation was his own oratorio, "El Pesebre" ("The Manger"), a lengthy composition dedicated "to those who have struggled and are still struggling for the cause of peace and democracy."

WHITE HOUSE CONCERT

In this period of resurgence, Casals gave a widely publicized cello recital at the United Nations in New York in 1958 to mark that organization's 13th anniversary. Three years later he played to a distinguished gathering at the White House on the invitation of President John F. Kennedy.

The public attention that Casals generated in those years helped also to swell sales of his cello recordings, and this, in turn, created new esteem for his wizardry with the bow. Thousands who never saw him nonetheless came to know him intimately.

Another element of his appeal to the public was his apparent refusal to age or grow stale. "Sometimes I feel like a boy," he told

an interviewer in 1964. "Music does that. I can never play the same piece twice in the same way. Each time it is new."

Watching him rehearse an orchestra when he was 89, an astonished student exclaimed: "When the maestro came onto the stage he looked 75. When he stepped on the podium he seemed even 10 years younger. And when he began to conduct he could have been a youngster ready to chase Easter eggs."

INNOVATIONS IN PLAYING

In the musical world, Casals' enduring reputation was associated with two accomplishments: his single-handed restoration to the repertory of Bach's cello music, especially the six magnificent unaccompanied suites; and his innovations in bowing and fingering that gave the cello a new and striking personality in orchestral and solo works.

He greatly lightened the work of the left hand, for example, by changes of finger positions, thus adding to its mobility. He also showed that it was possible to attain fresh subtleties in tone by freer bowing.

His own style was aristocratic. He made the most difficult passages seem simple yet luscious, all the while shunning pyrotechnics and gimmicks.

Casals came upon the Bach suites by accident when he was 13 years old and browsing with his father in a Barcelona music shop.

"I forgot entirely the reason of my visit to the shop and could only stare at this music which nobody had told me about," he said years afterward. "Sometimes even now, when I look at the covers of that old music, I see again the interior of that old and musty shop with its faint smell of the sea."

"I took the suites home and read and reread them. For 12 years after that I studied and worked every day at them. I was nearly 25 before I had the courage to play one of them in public."

When he did play them, the suites were disclosed as a transcendent musical experience, not the abstract exercises they had previously been believed to be.

"For me, Bach is like Shakespeare. He has known all and felt all," Casals told Bernard Taper in a profile published in *The New Yorker* in 1961. "He is everything. Everything except a professor. Professor Bach I do not know. When people ask me how I play Bach, I say, 'I play him as the pianist plays Chopin.' There is such fantasy in Bach—but fantasy with order."

Casals was of medium stature—not much taller than his Groffriller cello—and not heavily built. The top of his head had been bald since his early 20's. In repose, his face and his blue-gray eyes (behind round glasses) tended to be somber, but a smile imparted radiance and geniality to his face.

He was direct in his speech, exceedingly polite, a careful dresser (youthful photographs show him to have been quite a dandy in a romantic sort of way) and quietly dignified. He relaxed by reading, playing tennis, chatting with friends, smoking a pipe (he was rarely without one) and, in his late years, by watching Westerns on television.

To hear Casals was a moving and memorable experience. He sat with his eyes closed, his head turned sidewise and a little lifted, as though he were communing with some secret muse. His fingering and his bowing were so flawless that they seemed automatic, yet it was evident that they resulted from concentration.

He had superb savoir-faire. Once when a loose cuff bothered him, he stopped playing, slowly took off the cuff, put it on the floor and resumed playing where he had left off. When a string broke he would retire from the stage, replace it and, returning to his chair, start the solo from the beginning, such was his drive for perfection.

When Casals played a chamber music program at Perpignan, France, in July, 1951,

Howard Taubman, then music critic of The New York Times, wrote:

"As a musician Casals is all of a piece. Whether he conducts as he did in the second orchestral program of the Bach-Mozart-Beethoven festival . . . or plays the cello, there is a fine-grained consistency running through all his musical labors . . .

"His work at the cello . . . was remarkable for its modesty and restraint, and if one listened closely one could hear innumerable felicities of technical mastery. As an admiring violinist observed, 'Do you note the four shades of color he got in one bow?'"

Casals was an ardent supporter of the Spanish Republican Government. He never reconciled himself to the Franco regime, which he considered tyrannical. With the Franco victory in 1939 he went into self-imposed exile, living until 1956 in Prades, France, some 40 miles from the Spanish frontier.

Up until 1958 he refused to visit the United States because it recognized Franco. "I have great affection for the United States," he said when he moved to Puerto Rico, "but as a refugee from Franco Spain I cannot condone America's support of a dictator who sided with America's enemies, Hitler and Mussolini. Franco's power would surely collapse without American help."

But Casals bent his attitude sufficiently to play at the United Nations in 1958 because of "the great and perhaps mortal danger [of nuclear war] threatening all humanity."

Then in 1961 he relented further and played at the White House. In subsequent years he came to this country for regular yearly visits.

Pablo Carlos Salvador Defillo de Casals was born in the Catalan town of Vendrell, 40 miles from Barcelona, on Dec. 29, 1876, the second of 11 children of Carles and Pilar Defillo de Casals. His father was the town organist.

"From my earliest days," Casals recalled, "music was for me a natural element, an activity as natural as breathing." He could sing in tune before he would talk clearly, and at the age of 5 he was a soprano in the church choir. His father taught him the piano, violin and organ, and when he was 8 he began substituting for his father as church organist.

Shortly after Pablo's 10th birthday he heard a cello for the first time when José García performed in Vendrell. After some coaxing, the elder Casals bought his son a cello and gave him a few lessons. Pablo was fascinated by the instrument and proved so adept at it that he quickly exhausted his father's pedagogical abilities.

ENROLLED IN MUSIC SCHOOL

With his mother's backing and against the wishes of his father (who wanted the boy to become a carpenter), Pablo—not quite 12—went with his mother to Barcelona, where he enrolled in the Barcelona Municipal School of Music. To earn his living he played evenings for dances with a trio at the Café Tost, and later he persuaded the owner to devote one night a week to classical music.

That night attracted serious musicians to the bistro, including Isaac Albéniz, the composer and pianist. When Casals was graduated from music school at the age of 17 with first prizes for cello, piano and composition, Albéniz gave him a letter of introduction to Count Guillermo de Morphy, a music patron who was an adviser to Queen Mother Maria Christina in Madrid.

The Count, taken with the young cellist, introduced him to Maria Christina, who was also charmed and who granted him a monthly stipend of 250 pesetas (about \$50) for his studies.

Casals lived in Madrid from 1894 to 1897, going to school at the Royal Conservatory of Music, playing duets with the Queen Mother

(she was a fair pianist), chatting with the child who was to become Alfonso XIII and being guided in his general education by the Count de Morphy.

From Madrid, Casals and his mother went to Brussels, but, miffed by an unfriendly reception at an audition there, he went to Paris, where he played at the Folies-Marigny at a wage barely sufficient to keep him and his mother from starvation. After a short time they returned to Barcelona, where Casals got a job teaching at the music school. For two years he taught cello, played it in the Barcelona Opera orchestra, gave concerts in churches and formed a string quartet, all the while saving money for a return to Paris.

In the fall of 1899, just before his 23d birthday, he arrived in that city again, carrying a letter of introduction to Charles Lamoureux, the eminent conductor, from the Count de Morphy. When Casals presented himself for an audition, the conductor was annoyed by the intrusion. Nonetheless, the cellist sat down and began to play parts of the Lalo Cello Concerto. With the first notes, Lamoureux hoisted himself up from his desk and stood facing Casals until he finished playing, whereupon he embraced the young man and said, "My boy, you are one of the elect!"

SENSATIONAL DEBUT

Lamoureux immediately engaged him to play the Lalo concerto with his orchestra, and Casals made his Paris debut Nov. 12, 1899. He created a sensation there, as he did in London shortly afterward. In Britain he also played for Queen Victoria.

From then on his career was made, and he never lacked for engagements or for an audience. He commanded top fees, but lived economically.

For the next 20 years, until 1919, Casals, using Paris as his base, played in the principal cities of Europe and the Americas. He made his New York debut in 1904, playing the Saint-Saëns Cello Concerto with the orchestra of the Metropolitan Opera and winning a chorus of critical bravos. Later that season he was the cello soloist here in Richard Strauss's "Don Quixote," with the composer conducting his own tone poem.

Many of Casals's performances in those years were chamber music, which he played with Jacques Thibaud, the violinist, and Alfred Cortot, the pianist. In the United States he also gave chamber music recitals with Harold Bauer, the pianist, and Fritz Kreisler, the violinist, and with Kreisler and Ignace Paderewski, the pianist.

In that period Casals formed intimate friendships with such musicians as Georges Enesco, Maurice Ravel, Camille Saint-Saëns, Sergei Rachmaninoff, Gregor Piatigorsky, Emanuel Feuermann, Artur Schnabel, Eugene Ysaie and Paul Hindemith.

In 1914 Casals married Susan Metcalfe, the American lieder singer. It was his second marriage, the first to Guilhemina Suggia, a Portuguese cellist, in 1906, had ended in divorce six years later. For several years Casals was the piano accompanist for Miss Metcalfe, a soprano, and at one point he considered dropping his career to further hers. However, the couple parted in 1920.

After World War I and with the breakup of his marriage, the cellist turned his energies to Barcelona, where, in 1920, he founded the Orquestra Pau (Catalan for Pablo) Casals and subsidized it for seven years at a total cost of \$320,000 until it became self-supporting. In these years (and afterward) he was its principal conductor.

Early in the nineteen-twenties Casals also founded the Workingmen's Concert Association in Barcelona, which gave its members, in return for nominal dues, an opportunity to attend Sunday morning concerts of his orchestra and to set up their own musical groups.

As busy as Casals was in Barcelona, he also found time to give concerts in the

United States and in Europe and to appear in what seemed increasingly to be his favorite role, that of a conductor. He led the London Symphony, the New York Symphony and the Vienna Philharmonic.

When the Spanish Republic was proclaimed in 1931, Casals became one of its eager and hard-working supporters, all the more because the Republic restored many of his native Catalonia's ancient rights and granted the area a good deal of autonomy. He was president of Catalonia's music council the Junta de Musica, and, during the Civil War, he gave hundreds of benefit concerts abroad for the Republic and put a large part of his personal savings at its disposal. The Government, in turn, named streets and squares for him and encouraged his exertions to bring great music to the common people.

Casals was in Barcelona in January, 1939, when the Franco forces burst into the city, but he made good an escape to France, vowing never to return to Spain while Franco was in power. (Apart from a fleeting trip to Spain in 1955 to attend the funeral of his long-time close friend and housekeeper, Mrs. Francesca Vidal de Capdevila, he never did.)

After several demoralizing weeks of despondency in Paris, during which he grieved for his country, he went to live in Prades among the thousands of Spanish exiles. There he helped to organize the care of the Catalans held in French camps and solicited funds for them from his friends all over the world. He continued to live in Prades in World War II.

Toward the end of the war he went on tour again. In the autumn of 1945, however, he cut short a concert trip in Britain and retired to Prades.

In explanation, he said he had assumed that an Allied victory would doom not only Hitler and Mussolini but also Franco. The democracies, he went on, had disillusioned him by not acting to topple Franco. He was therefore suspending his concert career until Spain was freed. He had, he pointed out, ceased playing in Germany with the rise of Hitler, had not played in Italy in the thirties, nor had he appeared in Russia after the Bolshevik Revolution. He said he could not separate his beliefs as a human being from his conduct as an artist.

Casals lived quietly and simply in Prades for close to 12 years. In 1950, however, he was prevailed upon to soften somewhat his vow of musical silence and take part in a Bach bicentenary festival. The event, which attracted hundreds of music lovers from many parts of the world, was held in the big Church of St. Pierre in Prades. The critics found that Casals's bow had lost none of its magic.

In that and subsequent Prades festivals Casals appeared in a triple role—as soloist, as chamber music ensemble player and as conductor. In these concerts he was joined by many internationally famous musicians, including Dame Myra Hess, Rudolf Serkin, Joseph Szigeti and Isaac Stern.

Some indication of a further shift in Casals's thinking came in 1951 in a colloquy with Albert Schweitzer, the humanitarian and philosopher. "It is better to create than to protest," Dr. Schweitzer said in urging the cellist to return to the concert stage. "Why not do both—why not create and protest both?" Casals replied. And he seemed to follow that course in his last years.

After a period of self-examination, Casals went to Mexico in 1956 for his first concert date outside the Prades area. It was there, in 1960, that "El Pesebre" had its premiere. The oratorio became the banner of his peace mission, which he carried to many major cities in the Western world. Discussing this crusade, he said in 1962:

"As a man, my first obligation is toward the welfare of my fellow men. I will endeavor to meet that obligation through music, the means which God has given me, since it

transcends language, politics and national boundaries."

In August, 1957, when he was 80, he married Marta Montañez, one of his cello students, who was then 21. They lived in a cheerful modern house on the beach at San-turce, P.R., where Casals liked to take an early morning stroll before beginning his day by playing a Bach work on the piano. "It is like a benediction on the house," he said.

Casals had the unstinted admiration of his fellow artists. And one of them, Mr. Stern, put their feelings this way:

"He has enabled us to realize that a musician can play in a way that is honest, beautiful, masculine, gentle, fierce and tender—all these together, and all with unequivocal respect for the music being played and faith in it."

Appearing in New York last summer for a free Central Park concert with Mr. Stern—it was cut short by rain before the cellist could perform—Casals pronounced what could stand as his epitaph.

"What can I say to you?" he asked the assemblage. "I am perhaps the oldest musician in the world. I am an old man, but in many senses a very young man. And this is what I want to be, young, young all your life, and to say things to the world that are true."

TRIBUTE TO CALIFORNIA HOSPITAL WOMEN'S AUXILIARY

HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 24, 1973

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate the Women's Auxiliary of California Hospital who will, on Friday, November 2, celebrate 50 years of volunteer service to the greater Los Angeles community. I am happy to join in this expression of appreciation and gratitude to the many members of the women's auxiliary who have, over the past half century, given generous support and tireless effort to help provide for the health care needs in the Los Angeles area. The California Hospital is a member of the Lutheran Hospital Society of Southern California, and the president, Samuel J. Tibbitts, is a constituent of my 24th Congressional District, residing in San Marino, Calif. A great many of my constituents have participated in a meaningful way to contribute to the beneficial works of the auxiliary, and I would like to submit to my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives a brief review of the activities of California Hospital's Women's Auxiliary over the past 50 years:

BACKGROUND INFORMATION, WOMEN'S AUXILIARY OF CALIFORNIA HOSPITAL

Founded on November 21, 1923, the Women's Auxiliary of California Hospital is entering its second half-century of volunteer service—proud of its venerable history and young enough in spirit to adapt to changing times and fresh perspectives.

The Auxiliary, one of the first hospital-affiliated women's groups to be organized in California, now has more than 600 members. They provide a wealth of services and fund-raising support to California Hospital Medical Center, a major 325-bed non-profit institution encompassing acute and out-patient care, educational programs and research activities.

Launched in 1887 as the third health care facility in Los Angeles, CHMC now includes the following divisions: the California Hospital School of Nursing, the California Pediatric Center and the Southern California Cancer Center.

In addition to staging periodic benefit events, Auxiliary members are involved in supplying tray favors; hostessing expectant mothers at "Stork Socials"; allocating scholarships for nursing students, and assisting at their capping and graduation exercises; operating the hospital's Gift Shop; overseeing baby photos and supplying substantial financial aid to the maternity and gynecology clinics.

Over the years, Auxiliary volunteers have donated more than one million volunteer hours and contributed nearly \$700,000.00, earmarked for the medical center's growth and expansion.

Substantial donated sums have been used to help finance new physical medicine and emergency units, the prayer chapel, the pediatric wing, a remodeled medical-surgical unit, and the ultra-modern new Diagnostic and Treatment Center.

The Auxiliary was formed at the suggestion of G. W. Olson, then superintendent at California Hospital, who assembled women from several Lutheran churches. He asked them to organize an auxiliary—to work together to provide a "free bed" for impoverished patients. The call to organize was met enthusiastically, with 66 women signing the charter.

During the first ten years of its existence, the Auxiliary underwrote costs for 142 "free bed" patients, in addition to donating \$7000.00 to the hospital. The Depression years put a temporary damper on fund-raising efforts, but the interest and enthusiasm of this dedicated band has remained undaunted to date.

JOHN C. CREAN

HON. THOMAS M. REES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 24, 1973

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, John C. Crean, one of the leading industrialists in the United States and founder and chairman of the board of Fleetwood Enterprises, is an individual whose dedication to the basic principles of American citizenship is worthy of the attention and commendation of this body.

Despite the great demands he must meet as the head of a large business organization, Mr. Crean has for many years given freely of his time and his resources for many philanthropic endeavors—all aimed toward giving a helping hand to his fellow man.

John C. Crean is indeed America's modern-day Horatio Alger. A native of Compton, Calif., Mr. Crean, an ex-paperboy and printer's devil, started from scratch a mere 20 years ago and built Fleetwood Enterprises into a dominant position in the design and manufacture of mobile homes and trailers.

And in the best tradition of good citizenship he is doing something to give back to the country and to his fellow Americans some of the benefits of his astounding success.

John Crean, and his gracious wife, Donna—parents to two sons and two

daughters—best express their interest in their multi-varied philanthropic activities:

We are happy to be able to share our success with others. Sharing and giving away some of our surplus helps keep our values straight.

While the Creans' philanthropic contributions are many and varied—including their gift of \$1 million toward the construction of a YMCA in Anaheim, Calif.—the unselfish use they make of their historic 93-acre Rancho Capistrano is worthy of particular attention.

The Creans have made available the beauty and facilities of this great California ranch to civic, philanthropic, and religious groups representing the entire spectrum of American life—and on an entirely free basis.

Practically every week in the year some of these groups are utilizing the ranch and enjoying its manifold facilities—particularly large encampments of Girl Scouts and Boy Scouts. These facilities include a historic ranchhouse, horse riding trails, picnic grounds, a municipal-sized swimming pool, and a private lake, stocked with fish.

Many thousands of people—young and old—have had and will continue to have the opportunity of enjoying and experiencing the beauty and the natural environment of this great California ranch—due to the generosity and the spirit of sharing as expressed by Mr. Crean.

I am proud to have John C. Crean as a citizen of my State, and I believe that the example that he has set should be an inspiration to citizens of our business community and most deserving of the highest commendation of this legislative body.

VICE PRESIDENT-DESIGNATE FORD SHOULD BE CONFIRMED

HON. ROBERT E. BAUMAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 24, 1973

Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am disturbed at attempts presently being made by some Members of the majority party to tie the confirmation of Representative GERALD FORD as Vice President to the continuing battle over Watergate-related matters, and to his position on one political issue or another. I think most Americans will find this shameful opposition unacceptable. I am happy to note that both of the daily newspapers in Baltimore, neither of which is particularly fond of the Republican administration these days, have stated editorially their wishes for speedy hearings and confirmation of Representative FORD, free of any extraneous conditions imposed on the basis of partisan considerations. I believe that their positions are correct, and I share them at this time with the membership:

[From the Baltimore Sun, Oct. 23, 1973]

A VICE PRESIDENT NEEDED

Congress has a duty under the Twenty-fifth Amendment to proceed with the filling

of the vice presidency regardless of the latest escalation in the Watergate crisis. Indeed, the case for giving the nation a second-in-command is more compelling than ever because of the weakness of the first-in-command. This is not a plea for the confirmation of Gerald R. Ford, *per se*, because Congress must look thoroughly into Mr. Ford's background and qualifications. But it is a plea that Mr. Ford not be held hostage to the erratic behavior of President Nixon—behavior that has led to crises for impeachment from some respected figures on Capitol Hill.

Senator Kennedy, among others, has argued that Mr. Nixon's selection of Mr. Ford should not be accepted so long as Mr. Ford supports the President's stand in the Watergate tapes controversy. We disagree. We disagree not because we in any way condone the President's intolerable attempts to put himself above the law. We disagree because in important matters a Vice President-designate (like a Vice President in office) must be expected to give the President his loyalty. The alternative would be a kind of stress that could be dangerous or disruptive to the country, as the Agnew affair proved in its final stages.

The very fact for the first time impeachment of the President is attracting serious attention lends a special importance to the selection of a new Vice President. Whether he is to be Mr. Ford or another nominee must remain beside the point pending the congressional inquiry of Mr. Ford. What is not beside the point, however, is the unsavory political situation that would develop if the Democratic majority in Congress sits tight and does nothing while Mr. Nixon's future is in doubt. In such a case, Speaker Carl Albert, a Democrat, would stand as next in line of succession to the Republican incumbent in the White House. And the partisan strife inherent in these circumstances would be such that Congress could never handle the impeachment process with the judicial detachment envisaged by the Constitution. Democrats would be subject to accusations of trying to gain the White House for narrow party interests. Those Republicans appalled by Mr. Nixon's conduct would be under terrible pressures not to reverse the voters' selection of a GOP President last November.

We have no faith in schemes whereby Mr. Albert would become President, select a competent Republican as Vice President and then—maybe—resign. The Twenty-fifth Amendment dealing with the presidential succession was framed seven years ago to meet some of the problems stemming from the relative inflexibility of our system. To manipulate its provisions would be an affront to the Constitution at a time when the spirit and language of that doctrine are our last refuge.

[From the Baltimore News American, Oct. 23, 1973]

WHAT'S GOING ON HERE?

The confirmation of Gerald Ford as vice president seems to be running into a Democratic roadblock that is as politically motivated as it is unwarranted. The Democrats in Congress are trying to link the Watergate tapes to Ford's confirmation, when one really has absolutely nothing to do with the other.

It is curious that the loudest advocates of delay are Senator Kennedy and Representative Thomas O'Neill Jr., both Democrats from Massachusetts which is the only state out of 50 that President Nixon failed to win in 1972. And it is curious that, without a vice president, the next heart beat to the White House belongs to the Speaker of the House, Carl Albert, a Democrat from Oklahoma.

Sen. Kennedy and his clique may be hoping for a confrontation between the President and the Supreme Court that will lead to impeachment proceedings against Mr. Nixon.

The odds against this taking place are large; even if impeachment proceedings were held, it remains unlikely that the President would be drummed out of office by Congress.

Then, why make such an issue over the vice presidency with so many ifs, buts and maybes strewn the road to a Democratic takeover of the White House? Why demand that Mr. Ford, who for 25 years in the House has never opposed the constitution, never urged an unconstitutional act, now give proof that he believes in the constitution? His quarter-century of service speaks eloquently to that point.

What's going on here is partisan politics as usual, at a time in this nation's history when the federal government is enduring a unique sequence of events.

The constitution requires a vice president. Congress should confirm Mr. Ford with deliberate speed. It is the one congressional action that can be taken right now to regularize the government.

OFFICE OF THE SPECIAL PROSECUTOR

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 24, 1973

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I am somewhat saddened by comments I have seen in the press and other news media in the last 18 or 20 hours indicating that those who would defend the recent actions of the President seem satisfied to suggest that now that the President of the United States has acknowledged that he, like other Americans, should obey the orders a court which are not under appeal but final in their nature, that this is sufficient unto the moment, and we should get on about other business and disregard the events that outraged the American public this last weekend.

The essential elements still missing from this country are public confidence in its President, in its government, and in its government's institutions. Until the President reassures the American people by reappointing the special prosecutor, Mr. Cox, or by appointing someone with the same mandate that the special prosecutor was given in the assurances that were made to the American people and Congress earlier this year by the President himself. That is, that these matters would be clearly and openly examined, and the public would be informed. I am afraid that the great outpouring of concern that was understandably demonstrated over this past weekend by the American people will not subside.

Simply turning over some of the tapes under duress of court orders will not and should not satisfy the peoples' demand for a full and honest investigation.

Mr. Speaker, President Nixon's firing of the special prosecutor, Archibald Cox, and the subsequent abolishment of his office, shocked the nation, and he has grossly misled the American people and the United States Congress in his previous support of the special prosecutor's office.

It appears that the President took it upon himself to break a solemn compact

when he was confronted with honest men who would not bend to his will. After urging that Watergate be "left to the courts," the President denied Mr. Cox the authority to return to the courts to obtain a judicial ruling on criminal evidence needed for prosecution. Mr. Cox had no choice—he was to forgo the notes and memoranda which were also covered by the subpoenas, and he was to forgo any attempt to obtain any similar evidence relating to the other aspects of his investigation—or be fired. We now know what happened.

The public outrage will not subside until the people are satisfied that the Watergate and related investigations will continue with some assurance of honesty and integrity. Mr. Nixon, and those who blindly support his actions, seem to be satisfied that he has shrewdly and effectively stopped the investigations of Watergate and related criminal activities by firing the special prosecutor when he thought the trail of lawlessness pursued by Mr. Cox was leading the prosecutors to the President and his cronies.

The Senate had proceeded in good faith with the appointment of Elliot Richardson as Attorney General. This was based largely on Mr. Nixon's solemn promise to the Senate concerning the provisions for an appointment of a special prosecutor.

The special prosecutor had received full authority to investigate and prosecute all offenses arising out of the 1972 presidential election. He had received full authority to conduct proceedings before grand juries and to review all documentary evidence available from any source. He had received full authority to determine whether or not to contest the assertion of "executive privilege" or any other testimonial privilege. He had received assurances that the Attorney General would not countermand or interfere with his decisions or actions. Finally, he had received assurances that he would not be removed from his duties except for extraordinary improprieties on his part.

Clearly, Mr. Nixon has vigorously shaken the confidence of the American people, its existing institutions and the Congress in the firing of the special prosecutor and the abolishment of his office. There is no reason for confidence in further prosecutions without the Office of the Special Prosecutor. How could a Justice Department continuation of the Cox investigation be credible when the President has demonstrated that enthusiastic investigation of criminal activity will threaten the prosecutor with being fired or forced out.

Chesterfield H. Smith, president of the American Bar Association, justified the creation of a special prosecutor's office in saying:

It would be improper for an investigation of the President himself, of the Office of the President, or of the Executive Branch of the Federal Government to be conducted by a prosecutor subject to the direction and control of the President.

The President told us he understood this and agreed to it.

Nixon's own appointee, William Ruckelshaus, former Deputy Attorney Gen-

eral, had expressed doubt that the Justice Department could conduct an independent investigation. He said:

For one thing, the department will be under such pressure after the events of the weekend that it might find it difficult "not to prosecute" when the evidence might be too slim to risk prosecution. He stressed that the investigation should be "done on an independent basis."

Former Attorney General Elliot Richardson, said just yesterday, that the administration should appoint a new prosecutor. He said that a "completely independent" special prosecutor "is an important guarantee of the integrity of any investigation." Mr. Richardson was the one gentleman who had restored our confidence in the honor and courage of men in public office when he resigned rather than compromise or succumb to pressure.

Mr. Speaker, it is my strong feeling that the President should reappoint Mr. Cox and his staff or appoint some other able and trustworthy prosecutor who will have the same privileges and rights of independence which the Senate and the President had agreed upon last spring.

Congress must not fail to insist that the President allow that these investigations be continued in the same honest and independent manner to which Mr. Cox and his staff had worked.

If the President fails to do this, it is up to the Congress to preserve the integrity of these investigations by reestablishing the Office of the Special Prosecutor.

A STATEMENT OF CONCERN

HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 24, 1973

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, as a result of the dramatic events of the past few weeks, people throughout the Nation have begun to question the fundamental values of this society and the future of the American political system. It is within this context that I want to share with you and my colleagues something that has come to my attention.

Recently, a statement of concern, focusing on moral and ethical principles in public life, was unanimously adopted by the Baptist Joint Committee on Public Affairs. The committee, which adopted the resolution October 3, is a denominational agency in the Nation's Capital maintained by eight national Baptist bodies in the United States.

This statement, I believe, is noteworthy for two reasons. Primarily, the group has succeeded in offering perceptive insight into some of our national problems. In addition, however, I think this statement is a good example of the kind of forceful leadership groups such as the Baptist Joint Committee can provide in a time of crisis. Mr. Speaker, the statement follows:

A STATEMENT OF CONCERN

Believing that separation of church and state does not mean separation of religion from government or politics, nor should it

imply the divorce of religion's basic moral and ethical principles from the conduct of public affairs, we voice our concern over some recent developments in public life and reaffirm our commitment to the fundamental principles of democracy.

At a time when there is widespread distrust of government resulting from the abuse of political power, we need to be reminded of the premises upon which our government was constituted. We are gratified that there is today a widespread reaction against this abuse. Indeed, we view this reaction as evidence of the intrinsic strength of our American tradition.

The times call for an affirmation of trust in the basic principles of the American system of democracy. These include: (1) government's powers are derived from the consent of the governed; (2) the harmful potential in any concentration of governmental power makes necessary the distribution of powers among those who make, execute, and interpret law; (3) government is to protect the rights and liberties, and to promote the well-being of all people; and (4) all public officials must be subject to law in both public and private conduct.

In affirming these principles, we express our faith in the ultimate triumph of the right and of the truth in a nation whose citizens are dedicated to justice and righteousness in every aspect of life. In this confidence, we urge our people to exemplify and to require character and integrity in both public and private life, and to discharge responsibly their duties as citizens. Moreover, we encourage our Christian young people to seek for themselves a vocation through which they may make their contribution to government and to society in general.

OKTOBERFEST

HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 24, 1973

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, the Oktoberfest celebrations held during the month of October is one of many ways which the German people illustrate their festive mood and their appreciation for all mankind.

I wish to insert into the RECORD a poem written by Otto H. Kappus, in 1966, entitled, "Amerika." I recommend this poem to all my colleagues as it portrays the feeling of the many German-Americans and of their concern for the protection of the civil and political rights of citizens in this country.

I insert both the German version and the English translation.

Both versions of the poem follows:

AMERICA

You, America, Freedom's land,
Best of all upon this earth,
To you will I devote my strength
Till life's last hour comes to me.
You have our highest dreams fulfilled
Of justice and equality,
And have fraternal hatred stilled
And freed us from all class dispute.
The weight from troubled soul you took,
The weight of vain and haughty pride,
Again restoring mankind's worth
And built for us an epoch new.
Whether Christian, Jew, German, Slav,
Whether black or white, rich or poor,
No matter what our ancestry,
All of us are equal here.

Millions have in you found keep,

Those oppressed in their own land
Here now in peace and quiet dwell
Where now new generations stand.

So let us thank our Mighty Father,
That we are freemen of this land,
And let us not relax or waver
Till all men know this fortune too.
OTTO H. KAPPUS.

SEPTEMBER 13, 1966.

AMERIKA

Amerika, Du Land der Freien,
Du bestes auf dem Erdenrund!
Dir will ich meine Kräfte weihen,
Bis zu der letzten Lebensstund'!

Du hast den höchsten Traum erfüllt
Von Gleichheit und Gerechtigkeit,
Und hast den Bruderhass gestillet,
Befreit uns von dem Klassenstreit.

Auch nimmst hinweg die Seelenbürde
Der eiteln Überheblichkeit.
Du gabst uns wieder Menschenwürde
Und schufst so eine neue Zeit.

Ob Juden, Christ', ob Slav', Germanen,
Ob weiss, ob schwarz, ob arm, ob reich,
Wer immer waren unsere Ahnen,
Hier sind wir all einander gleich.

So wurdest Du Zuflucht für Millionen,
Die einst bedrückt in ihrem Land,
Hier nun in Ruh' und Frieden wohnen,
Sodass ein neu Geschlecht erstand.

Drum lasst uns dem Allmächtigen danken,
Dass Bürger wir von diesem Land,
Und lasst uns weichen nicht noch wanken,
Bis alle Welt dies Glück erkannt!

OTTO H. KAPPUS.

13. September 1966.—Dem Bürgerverein gewidmet, am 30. September 1966.

NIXON'S FAILURE TO TRUST PEOPLE BRINGS MISTRUST OF GOVERNMENT

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 24, 1973

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, President George Meany recently addressed the American Federation of Labor-Congress of Industrial Organization Convention with his usual candor on the present administration's stewardship of the National Government. I am inserting excerpts of his remarks in the RECORD for the review of our colleagues:

NIXON'S FAILURE TO TRUST PEOPLE BRINGS MISTRUST OF GOVERNMENT

The past two years have been years of grave problems for America. The labor movement, obviously, has not escaped the problems that affect all Americans in their daily lives. Neither will we escape the problems that are certain to come in the future.

Overriding all others is the crisis of public confidence in the institutions of government. Certainly Watergate has played a role in eroding public trust in government. But the erosion began when the people perceived that the government did not trust them enough to tell them the whole truth.

The Administration did not tell them the whole truth about its economic policies and their terrible consequences for working people.

The Administration did not level with the American people about the Russian grain deal.

The Administration has not let the people

in on what is really going on in our international relations.

And surely the Administration cannot expect the full trust and confidence of the American people when it pursues tax policies that penalize them for not being rich, while rewarding corporate wealth and special interests.

In a democracy, government rests on the informed consent of the governed, and the informed consent of the people can only be won by a government of candor.

Watergate would not have brought on the constitutional confrontation that faces this country today if the truth had been told on June 18, 1972. The economy would not be on the brink of a recession if the President had lived up to his promise of February 19, 1969, that inflation would be curbed without increasing unemployment.

The free trade union movement in America grew out of the soil of democracy. It was nurtured by the rights and liberties which are enjoyed by free citizens. Whenever those rights are threatened, whenever people are subordinated to money, then the free trade union movement is threatened.

Every American is affected every day by this Administration's mismanagement of the economy. Economic controls, as practiced by this Administration, are a sham and a shame.

The economic picture is deteriorating. Swollen corporate profits and exorbitant interest rates are feeding inflation but the Administration refuses to restrain the worst inflationary factors in the economy.

Housing construction is at a virtual standstill and threatens to trigger widespread unemployment. Worker buying power is declining, yet the Administration continues inequitable wage controls and vetoes a minimum wage bill that would bring some small measure of economic relief to low-income workers.

In fact, economic conditions today closely resemble those that led to the recession of 1969-70 and threaten again to cause recession this year.

Contrary to the opinion of some commentators and editorialists, the trade union movement in America is alive and well.

Affiliated unions have reported some collective bargaining gains, despite employer eagerness to serve as enforcers of the President's wage controls. There continues to be a steady, appreciable gain in membership, led by organization of government employees. In addition, several unions have reported new interest on the part of white collar workers in joining the labor movement.

Particularly heartening is the increase in union membership among members of minority groups in all industries and trades. This development brings new strength and talent to the labor movement and at the same time represents another signpost of progress in the continuing struggle for civil rights. For the surest way for minorities to be able to enjoy their civil rights is through the economic security and human dignity for which the labor movement has always stood.

Today, the labor movement is stronger politically than it has ever been in history. Many unions that had no political action programs before have good programs now.

The 1974 election becomes more and more important with every veto. The President is determined to falsely tag Congress with a "do-nothing" label, as a means of countering Watergate and of diverting attention from his own legislative failures.

In reality, the President is not seeking speedier congressional action, nor is he attempting to work with Congress as a co-equal branch of government. The President is using the veto, threats of the veto, and the impoundment of funds to blackmail Congress into accepting his own narrow programs.

President Nixon labels every program that benefits people as "inflationary," and every

program that benefits the wealthy and the corporations as "in the national interest."

We reject that philosophy. We say that America cannot afford to junk decades of social progress for the many in the interest of further enrichment of the privileged and the powerful.

MEDIA VIOLENCE AND ITS EFFECT ON CHILDREN

HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 24, 1973

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, I recently had the opportunity to preview a report soon to be published in the American Psychological Association's journal *Development Psychology*, studying the effects of media violence on children's behavior. Violence has become an increasingly accepted part of our lives, due in part, to the increasing amount of violence we allow to penetrate our home entertainment. Many of us have been concerned that the American people can, and have been anesthetized to violence at home and abroad through increasingly violent programs on television. The APA study lends great support to this fear.

The study showed that children who saw an aggressive film and then were made responsible for monitoring the behavior of younger children were much less likely to seek appropriate adult help when the younger children misbehaved than children who had not seen the film. The children appeared to have learned to tolerate real life aggression by being exposed to media violence. This suggests the frightening possibility that while some children are incorporating media-initiated violent responses into their everyday behavior, even more may be learning to tolerate them. Viewing violence under the guise of "entertainment" may increase tolerance to aggression occurring in the real world, and thus make a person less willing to assist when he witnesses such behavior in his own life.

I commend this study to the attention of my colleagues:

DOES MEDIA VIOLENCE INCREASE CHILDREN'S TOLERATION OF REAL LIFE AGGRESSION? ¹

(By Ronald S. Drabman ² and Margaret Hanratty Thomas)

ABSTRACT

Twenty-two male and 22 female third and fourth graders were randomly divided into groups for a 2 (sex) by 2 (film, no film) factorial design. Children in the aggressive film group saw a cowboy film which depicted many violent events. All children were led to believe that they were responsible for watch-

ing the behavior of two younger children whom they could see on a video (TV) monitor. The younger children at first played quietly, then progressively became destructive. Their altercation culminated in a physical fight ending with the apparent destruction of the TV camera. The dependent measures were (1) the time it took a subject to seek adult help after the younger children began to be disruptive, and (2) whether or not the subject waited until the younger children had begun to abuse one another physically before seeking adult help. Results indicate that children who saw an aggressive film took longer to seek adult help than children who did not see the film. More importantly, children in the film group were much more likely to tolerate all but violent physical aggression and destruction before seeking help.

The widespread portrayal of violence in television and movies has come under strong attack during recent years due to increasing evidence that observation of such displays may foster similar behavior on the part of viewers. It is well documented that exposure to filmed violence may increase the likelihood that young children will exhibit aggressive behaviors toward both inanimate and live victims (e.g., Bandura, Ross, & Ross, 1961, 1963; Hanratty, et al., 1969; Hanratty, O'Neal, & Sulzer, 1972; Liebert & Baron, 1972). These authors have consistently demonstrated that the presentation of media violence can provide opportunity for acquisition of novel aggressive skills and can encourage performance of similar behaviors through modeling and disinhibitory influences.

In addition to these effects, however, it appears reasonable to speculate that observation of filmed aggression may affect viewers in other undesirable ways. There is some evidence to suggest that children's conceptions of reality may be influenced by media dramatizations. In a study by Siegel (1958), seven-year-old children who heard radio serials about taxi drivers were asked to predict the ending of a newspaper story that was focused on a local cab driver. Those children who had listened to a dramatization in which taxi drivers were portrayed as being unusually aggressive attributed much more violence to the driver in the newspaper story than did children who had heard a radio serial in which taxi drivers behaved in a non-violent manner. The conclusion that children's attitudes about the real world may be affected by fictional presentations is strengthened by the fact that only children who understood that newspapers report real events were retained in the final analysis.

Also, some writers have suggested that repeated observation of violence can result in emotional habituation (e.g., Goranson, 1970). Indeed, Berger (1962) demonstrated that adult subjects' emotional arousal progressively declined while watching a victim receive a large number of painful electric shocks. Similar findings have been reported by Lazarus and his associates (Lazarus, 1966; Lazarus & Alfert, 1964; Spelsman, Lazarus, Mordkoff, & Davidson, 1964).

If observation of violence serves to shape viewers' expectancies about real life and behavior and/or reduce emotional responsivity to witnessed violence, it seems likely that reactions to aggression encountered in everyday life may be affected significantly by exposure to media violence. Specifically, it is proposed that viewing violence under the guise of "entertainment" may increase one's tolerance of aggression which occurs in the real world and thus make one less willing to aid when he witnesses such behavior in his own life. The present study was designed to assess the effects of viewing filmed violence and children's subsequent readiness to report to an authority figure an argument and fight between two younger children.

¹ The assistance of Gregory J. Jarvie who served as the experimenter is gratefully acknowledged. Thanks for providing subjects are due Sister Ann Olivia, principal of St. James School. This research was supported, in part, by National Institute of Mental Health Grants 1-RO3-MH24502-01 and 1-RO3-MH22189-01A1 to the first and second authors, respectively.

² Requests for reprints should be sent to Ronald S. Drabman, Department of Psychology, Florida Technological University, Box 5000, Orlando, Florida 32816.

METHOD

Participants and design

The subjects were 22 boys and 22 girls from the third and fourth grades of a parochial elementary school which serves a predominantly middle class area of a southern city. The study was carried out near the end of the school year. The same 21-year-old adult white male acted as the experimenter for all subjects. The experimental design was a 2x2 factorial with the variables of treatment condition (aggressive film versus no film) and sex of subject.

Procedure

The experimenter met each subject individually at the classroom and explained that he wanted the subject to "play some games." He then remarked that he was ahead of schedule and suggested that before beginning he show the subject his "new trailer." Upon arrival at the trailer, which was located in the school yard, the experimenter explained that the trailer was being used sometimes by a friend to work with kindergarten children from another school. The large room inside the trailer contained a variety of toys suitable for young children (i.e., a large number of blocks, picture books, crayons, and toy milk bottles). At the far end of the room, a large camera was mounted on a tripod. The experimenter pointed to the camera and said: "We have a T.V. camera here. It takes pictures of everything going on in this room. In fact, it's taking pictures of us right now!" The experimenter then escorted the subject to a room in the school building where they were to "play games." Subjects in the aggressive film group were then shown an 8-minute western featuring Hopalong Cassidy. The film depicted several gunbattles, shootings, and fistfights. Immediately thereafter, the experimenter glanced at his watch and explained that he needed to make an important phone call. He then continued:

"I have somewhat of a problem. You see, I promised my friends who will be working with younger children in the trailer today that I would watch the children for him while he's gone. See, I can turn on this T.V. set and watch what's happening in the trailer. [The experimenter then turned on the monitor which showed the still vacant trailer.] Oh good! They haven't gotten there yet. There's no one there now. Well, I might get back before they arrive, but if I don't, could you watch the children for me? Thanks a lot. Just watch the T.V. and if the children get there before I come back, then you keep an eye on them. I imagine they'll be O.K. but sometimes little kids can get into trouble, and that's why an older person should be watching them. If anything does happen, come get me. I'll be in the principal's office."

Subjects in the no film group were given the same instructions immediately after their arrival at the room in the school building.

Each child then witnessed the same videotaped sequence. The purpose of the visit to the trailer was to insure that the subject would believe that the events he saw on the monitor were live.

After two minutes of tape which showed the unoccupied trailer, an adult male and two young children (a 4-year-old girl and a 5-year-old boy of approximately equal size) entered the trailer. The adult told the children that he had to leave, but that they could play while he was gone. After the adult left the children played quietly with crayons and paper for approximately one minute. They then each built two structures with the blocks. The girl criticized the boy's building, stating that hers was much nicer. After an interchange of derogatory comments, the boy maliciously knocked over one of the

girl's buildings. The children continued arguing and destroyed each other's remaining buildings. They then began to push and threaten one another. The girl began chasing the boy, crying, while he taunted her with repeated shouts of "You can't catch me!" She hit him several times and, as they struggled near the camera, it appeared as though it was knocked over and had fallen to the floor. At this point, the video portion went dead, and the radio briefly continued while the children yelled accusations of blame at each other. Finally, the boy shouted "Watch out!", and a loud crash was heard. No more sounds were audible afterward.

The experimenter remained in the hallway outside the room and recorded the time which had elapsed from the beginning of the tape and the moment at which the subject left the room to notify him. If the subject did not respond within 70 seconds after the audio portion ended, the experimenter reentered the room and inquired if anything happened.

Debriefing

The experimenter immediately assured the subject that everything was being taken care of. He told the subject that his friend was now at the trailer and that no real harm had been done. No child appeared to have been upset by the experience. Finally, the experimenter asked the subject to solve five mazes and praised his performance warmly. Each child was thanked for his participation and given a candy bar.

RESULTS

Latency scores were computed by subtracting the amount of time which had elapsed before the first blocks were knocked down from the total time recorded by the experimenter. This number provided an accurate measure of the length of time during which the subject viewed the altercation before notifying the experimenter. Since these data were neither normally distributed nor showed homogeneity of error variance, nonparametric analyses were used. Table 1 presents the median latency scores for subjects in each of the four experimental groups. Comparisons by Mann-Whitney *U* tests revealed that, as anticipated, children who had seen the aggressive film responded more slowly than children who had not seen the film ($z=1.82$; $p=.034$) while sex of subject was not related to speed of responding ($z=0.27$, $p=0.39$).

TABLE 1.—MEDIAN LATENCY SCORES (IN SECONDS) FOR SUBJECTS IN THE 4 GROUPS

	Males	Females
Film.....	Md=104 range=13 to 196	Md=119 range=59 to 196
No film.....	Md=63 range=13 to 196	Md=75 range=21 to 139

Furthermore, since the primary interest was to determine the effect of viewing aggression and children's subsequent toleration of such behavior, subjects who notified the experimenter were classified on the basis of whether they responded to the children's arguing and destruction of each other's property or whether they responded only after more extreme forms of aggressive behavior were witnessed (i.e., hitting each other or breaking the camera). An analysis of these data (presented in Table 1) revealed a highly significant effect for treatment condition ($\chi^2=6.69$, $df=1$, $p<.01$). Whereas 58% of those subjects in the no film condition who notified the experimenter did so before the children began to fight physically, only 17% of the subjects in the film group responded

to this type of aggression. Nonresponders were excluded from this analysis. There were 4 nonresponders in the film group and 3 in the no film condition. An analysis with these subjects included yielded similar results

$$(\chi^2=6.70, df=1, p<.05).$$

Analysis of the relationship between sex and number of responders before and after the critical event yielded no differences.

$$(\chi^2=1.93, df=1, p>.17).$$

TABLE 2.—SUBJECTS SEEKING HELP BEFORE OR AFTER PHYSICAL VIOLENCE

	Number of subjects responding before	Number of subjects responding after
Film.....	3	15
No film.....	11	8

Note: Nonresponders were excluded from this analysis.

Similarly, nonresponders were excluded from this analysis. There were 5 boys and 2 girls who failed to respond. An analysis with these subjects included also failed to reach significance ($\chi^2=0.42$, $df=1$, $p>.50$).

DISCUSSION

These results provide support for the notion that children's responsivity to real life aggression may be affected by previous observation of fictional violence. Latency scores were related to exposure to the aggressive film, and the basis on which the subject's decision to summon adult help was made also is clearly influenced by this variable. Several possible explanations of this effect are tenable. First of all, if media presentations furnish children with a concept of "what the world is really like" (National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence, 1969; Siegel, 1958), then witnessing aggressive behavior on television and in movies may serve to make the viewer more likely to consider conflict and fighting as normative behaviors. Thus, when real life aggression is witnessed, it is not considered to be surprising or unusual and therefore does not seem to warrant action on the part of the observer. A similar interpretation is focused on contrast effects. Since it is quite unlikely that one might see aggression in his own life which is as extreme as that usually presented in the media, real life aggression might often seem to be trivial in comparison. Also, exposure to violence may reduce emotional responsivity to subsequent scenes of violence (Goranson, 1970) thereby making it less likely that individuals will react quickly. Because the subjects in the control group did not see a film, differential arousal might be offered as an alternative explanation for these findings. However, since all subjects were told explicitly what they should do, it would seem that if subjects who had seen the aggressive film were more aroused than subjects in the no film group, then increased arousal should result in quicker responding by subjects in the film group (e.g., Spence, 1956; Zajonc, 1965). Further research is necessary to explore these alternative interpretations.

Many questions remain unanswered, and research is currently underway to investigate the impact of such variables as the degree and type of violence exhibited in the aggressive film, the age of the subjects, and characteristics of the participants in the real life aggression. However, the results of this study, taken together with others in which the modeling and disinhibitory effects of media violence have been demonstrated (Bandura, Ross, & Ross, 1961, 1963; Hanratty et al., 1969; Hanratty, O'Neil, & Sulzar, 1972; Lie-

bert & Baron, 1972), suggest the frightening possibility that while some children are incorporating such violent responses into their everyday behavior, even more may be learning to tolerate them.

REFERENCES

- Bandura, A., Ross, D., & Ross, S. A. Transmission of aggression through imitation of aggressive models. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 1961, 63, 575-582.
- Bandura, A., Ross, D. & Ross, S. A. Imitation of film-mediated aggressive models. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 1963, 66, 3-11.
- Berger, S. Conditioning through vicarious instigation. *Psychological Review*, 1962, 69, 405-456.
- Goranson, R. E. Media violence and aggressive behavior: A review of experimental research. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology*. Vol. 5, New York: Academic Press, 1970.
- Hanratty, M. A., Liebert, R. M., Morris, L. W., & Fernandez, L. E. Imitation of film mediated aggression against live and inanimate victims. *Proceedings of the American Psychological Association*, 1969, 77, 457-458.
- Hanratty, M. A., O'Neal, E., & Sulzer, J. L. The effect of frustration upon imitation of aggression. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 1972, 21, 30-34.
- Lazarus, R., *Psychological stress and the coping process*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1966.
- Lazarus, R., & Alfert, E. The short-circuiting of threat. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 1964, 69, 195-205.
- Liebert, R. M., & Baron, R. A. Some immediate effects of televised violence on children's behavior. *Developmental Psychology*, 1972, 6, 469-475.
- National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence, *To establish justice, to insure domestic tranquility*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1969.
- Siegel, A. The influence of violence in the mass media upon children's role expectations. *Child Development*, 1958, 29, 35-36.
- Spence, K. G. *Behavior theory and conditioning*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1956.
- Spiesman, J., Lazarus, R., Mordkoff, A., & Davidson, L. Experimental reduction of stress based on ego-defense theory. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 1964, 68, 367-380.
- Zajonc, R. B. Social facilitation. *Science*, 1965, 149, 269-274.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT STUDY SUPPORTS THE VANIK-MOSS AP- PROACH TO CONSERVE GASOLINE

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 24, 1973

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, the recent cutoff of petroleum supplies by the Arab States to the United States underlines the importance we must now attach to immediate efforts to cut down our wasteful consumption of irreplaceable petroleum. The gas-gulping American automobile presents us with an ideal starting point.

Despite the fact that as a nation we account for only 5.7 percent of the world's population, we own 46.1 percent

of the world's automobiles. There are 97.65 million cars circulating around our country, consuming 73.5 million gallons of gasoline each year—that is 14.3 percent of the total energy this Nation consumes.

In recent years the efficiency of the American automobile has seriously declined. Contrary to popular attitudes, this decline is attributable not so much to emission control as to increased vehicle weight and more optional equipment. This trend can and must be reversed. I have introduced with Senator FRANK MOSS legislation to encourage the production of more efficient automobiles through the imposition of a graduated excise tax (H.R. 9859).

The administration has been taking quiet steps in this direction. Under Secretary of the Interior John C. Whitaker recently announced that the Interior Department is actively contemplating the taxation of inefficient automobiles.

In addition, the Treasury Department has done some excellent work in evaluating the strength of the tax approach. Using a tax schedule similar to the one I have proposed in H.R. 9859, Treasury estimates that 1 million barrels of gasoline a day could be saved by 1980—that is the equivalent of over 2 million barrels of crude oil.

For the interest of my colleagues I am submitting this Treasury study to the RECORD:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT STUDY SUMMARY

This study recommends a fuel economy tax to be levied on automobiles beginning in 1975.

The tax is based upon miles per gallon ratings developed by a uniform testing procedure to be conducted by automobile manufacturers under EPA guidance.

Basically the tax would establish a national automobile standard of 20 miles per gallon. Cars getting that mileage or better would pay no excise tax. Less efficient cars would pay a tax proportional to their fuel consumption. This tax was developed in lieu of a horsepower tax or a weight tax which are shown to be less effective.

The purpose of the tax is to save gasoline through encouraging the industry to design and produce more efficient vehicles. The basis for setting the tax rates are studies which assert that the industry can produce large cars which yield close to 20 miles per gallon using existing technology without sacrificing comfort, styling, or exhaust emission standards.

The tax should have the following effects.

1. Through inducing manufacturers to produce more efficient cars and reducing automobile purchases of large cars, it would save increasing amounts of gasoline. By 1980, the saving should reach 1 million barrels a day of gasoline.

2. The revenue from the tax would peak at \$2.78 billion by 1976. Thereafter, it would rapidly decline as cars became more efficient and motorists increase their purchases of smaller cars. By 1980, the tax would draw about \$600 million per year.

The tax is similar to bills already introduced this year in the Senate and the House designed to accomplish the same purpose.

The draft of the paper has been reviewed by staff in EPA, the Department of Transportation, and in Treasury tax analysts.

Introduction

One recurring energy conservation suggestion has been the thought that we could save considerable amounts of gasoline if we were to shift to more efficient automobiles. This has been constantly in the news columns of late, for example, in the *New York Times Magazine* on June 10, 1973, entitled "Auto-Suggestion." This memorandum is an exploration of the concept of a tax designed to encourage vehicle economy.

The trend in vehicle economy

Miles per gallon in passenger vehicles has been coming down significantly since 1950. Automobiles in 1950 were averaging 14.95 miles per gallon. By 1972, this has dropped to 13.57. Why has automobile efficiency fallen so much? There seem to be several reasons.

a. Heavier cars

A study by the Environmental Protection Agency dated November 1972, entitled "Fuel Economy and Emission Control" indicates that vehicle weight is the most significant determinant of miles per gallon. Cars have been getting significantly heavier during the last 20 years. Each year the same model automobile is heavier than the year before. In 1955, for instance, the largest Ford V-8 weighed 3,236 lbs. By 1965, this weight grew to 3,422 lbs. and today a similar car weighs 4,292 lbs. The Cadillac Series 75 grew during the same period from 5,015 lbs. to 5,783 lbs. Even the Pinto grew from 1972 to 1973 from 2,094 lbs. to 2,216 lbs. In the absence of any economic incentives to reduce weight, therefore, cars are growing heavier, and hence greater users of fuel. On the other hand, much of the added weight has gone into safety or convenience features such as stronger frames, automatic transmissions, heavier but better tires, etc.

b. Increased accessories in automobiles

Factory installed power-using equipment has grown significantly in the last 10 years. Automatic transmissions have grown from 71 percent in 1960 to 93 percent in 1972. Power steering from 39 percent in 1960 to 86 percent in 1972. Factory air conditioning, the most costly of all, in terms of fuel use, has grown from 6.9 percent in 1960 to 70 percent in 1972. These added features require the use of additional gasoline.

c. Antipollution features

Pollution controls added since 1970 also take their toll in gasoline mileage. The EPA study shows that they have reduced engine efficiency by about 7 percent over comparable models without the pollution controls.

d. Urbanization of our population

We are becoming increasingly urbanized. Each year more of our population lives in urban areas and less in rural areas. In fact, 1960 to 1970, for instance, urban populations gained by 19.2 percent, whereas rural populations declined by 0.3 percent. This has a definite effect on mpg. City driving involves more stop and go, more idling, more fuel wastage than open country driving. This trend will probably continue.

The shift to smaller cars

Despite the long-term downward trend in fuel economy, the previous graph shows that in 1971 and 1972 the rate of decline in fuel economy has been less than it was in previous years. Why should this be so?

One important reason is that the public is shifting to the purchase of smaller cars. The following chart gives an indication of the change in the new car registrations during the last six years.

REGISTRATION OF NEW CARS BY GENERAL MARKET CLASS

1967-73 calendar years, percentage of total registrations

Market class	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971	1972	1973	1973 sales ¹ (thousands)
High price class (Cadillac, Lincoln, etc.)	2.9	2.6	2.9	2.3	2.7	2.7	2.4	238
Medium price class (Pontiac, Olds, Buick, etc.)	17.8	17.0	16.8	13.7	15.1	14.5	12.7	1,257
Regular size (Ford, Chevrolet, Plymouth, etc.)	28.6	27.0	25.7	22.5	20.9	19.3	16.3	1,614
Special sports type (Chevrolet Monte Carlo, Ford Mustang, Chevrolet Camaro, etc.)	12.8	11.7	11.1	10.3	8.6	8.2	9.9	980
Intermediate size (Ford Torino, Chevrolet, Olds Cutlass, etc.)	21.8	24.0	22.2	21.0	18.1	19.2	18.8	1,861
Compact size (Chevrolet Nova, Ford Maverick, Dodge Dart, Plymouth Valiant, etc.)	6.7	7.1	9.8	13.8	12.1	12.9	14.4	1,425
Subcompact size (Vega, Pinto, Gremlin)	1.6	1.6	1.6	1.6	7.4	8.2	9.6	950
Foreign cars	9.3	10.5	11.2	14.7	15.1	14.5	15.9	1,574
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	9,900

¹ Projected based on current trends and R. L. Polk data.

Source: Ward's Automobile Yearbook based on R. L. Polk data.

A more practical way of looking at the same figures is to see the change in the percent of large cars (medium, regular size, intermediate size, and special sports type) versus small cars (compact, sub-compact) and foreign cars since 1967. High price cars are excluded. They remain at the same level regardless of time and price and continue to be about 2.6 percent of the market. This could indicate that these vehicles occupy a special place in the market due to prestige or other reasons, and are highly price-inelastic.

The percentage of large cars has fallen from 81 percent in 1967 to 57.7 percent in 1973, while the percentage of compacts, sub-compacts and foreign cars has risen from 16.0 percent in 1968 to 39.9 percent in 1973. What this indicates is that the public is shifting its buying habits and buying smaller cars. Why should this be so?

Reasons for the shift

The reasons for shift to smaller cars appear to be many. One important reason may be that a higher percentage of the public are buying second and third cars now which tend to be smaller than the basic family car. The percentage of households which own two or more cars increased from 19.0 percent in 1961 to 29.8 percent in 1971, a 50 percent increase.

A second reason is a general change in the public taste in transportation. Foreign cars, for instance, have become popular, although their percentage of total U.S. sales have grown from 9.3 percent to 15.9 percent since 1967, a gain of 6.6 percent, while those of American make sub-compacts have grown from 0 to 9.6 percent in only three years.

It is unlikely that the increasing prices of new cars has been a major factor in encouraging car buyers to shift to less expensive models. New car prices have risen more slowly than those of the cost of living.

CAR PRICE INCREASES COMPARED WITH COST OF LIVING INCREASES

	Percent change from previous year	
	All Items ¹	Cars ²
1967	3.0	2.2
1968	4.7	3.63
1969	6.1	1.83
1970	5.5	3.51
1971	3.4	5.90
1972	3.4	2.62

¹ Source: Bureau of Labor Statistics, reported in the Economic Report of the President, 1973, p. 252.

² Automotive News Almanac, Apr. 30, 1973, p. 78.

In fact, in real terms, the percentage of the family income spent on automobile purchases is declining. In 1950 a new car represented 62 percent of the average family in-

come. By 1970, this figure had declined to 35%.*

AFL-CIO URGES NIXON RESIGNATION

HON. BELLA S. ABZUG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 24, 1973

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, October 22, 1973, the AFL-CIO, the Nation's most powerful labor organization, called for President Nixon's resignation, or if the President refuses to resign, impeachment:

We believe that the American people have had enough. More than enough.

We therefore call upon Richard Nixon, President of the United States, to resign.

We ask him to resign in the interest of preserving our democratic system of government, which requires a relationship of trust and candor between the people and their political leaders.

We ask him to resign in the interest of restoring a fully functioning government, which his Administration is too deeply in disarray to provide.

We ask him to resign in the interest of national security.

If Mr. Nixon does not resign, we call upon the House of Representatives forthwith to initiate impeachment proceedings against him.

They also asked that Congress hold up the consideration of Representative GERALD FORD for Vice President:

Clearly, a President who has placed himself on the brink of impeachment should not be allowed to name his successor until the charges against him have been disposed of satisfactorily.

I insert the full text of the AFL-CIO statement for the benefit of my colleagues:

STATEMENT BY THE AFL-CIO EXECUTIVE COUNCIL ON PRESIDENT NIXON TO THE 10TH CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION, BAL HARBOUR, FLA., OCTOBER 22, 1973

The Constitutional crisis that began with what the White House once described as a "third-rate burglary" has now been brought to a head by the absolutely unprecedented and shocking actions of President Nixon within the last 48 hours.

* Source: 1972 Automobile Facts and Figures, page 41.

In rapid succession, these events have taken place:

The President demanded that Attorney General Elliot Richardson fire special Watergate prosecutor Archibald Cox. Richardson refused and resigned. The President demanded that Deputy Attorney General William D. Ruckelshaus fire Cox. Ruckelshaus refused and was fired. The President ordered his Solicitor General, Robert H. Bork, to fire Cox, and Bork, now Acting Attorney General, complied. The President ordered the FBI to seal off the offices of the special prosecutor, the Attorney General and the Deputy Attorney General—thereby, in effect, taking possession of the Watergate evidence.

These incredible actions have revealed the extent to which Mr. Nixon is prepared to go to prevent the full disclosure of evidence relating to the Watergate cover-up and other charges of criminal conduct by high government officials. He had already refused the orders of two courts to turn nine of his tapes bearing on the Watergate matters over to Judge John Sirica.

The President seems determined not to discharge the chief obligation of his office. Article II, Section 3 of the Constitution states that, "he shall take care that the laws be faithfully executed." But Mr. Nixon seems utterly determined to frustrate the full and impartial administration of the law.

When the Senate Judiciary Committee confirmed the appointment of Cox, it acted with the understanding, spelled out in the guidelines drawn up by the Attorney General, on May 19, that he would have:

"full authority with respect to . . . determining whether or not to contest the assertion of 'executive privilege' or any other testimonial privilege. . . . The attorney general will not countermand or interfere with the special prosecutor's decisions or actions . . . The special prosecutor will not be removed from his duties except for extraordinary improprieties on his part."

The special prosecutor's decision to press forward on the legal front to obtain the President's tapes hardly constitutes an "extraordinary impropriety." On the contrary, it constitutes the fulfillment of his mandate to "review all documentary evidence available from any source, as to which he shall have full access."

Similarly, the refusal of Attorney General Richardson to fire Cox was in accordance with the understanding between him and the special prosecutor, which understanding was also at the basis of the Senate's confirmation of Mr. Richardson as Attorney General.

Mr. Nixon's determination to prevent judicial examination of his tapes, no matter what the cost to our constitutional system, can only further erode public confidence in him. When the President appears fearful of facing a Supreme Court composed in large

measure of his own appointees, the public can scarcely resist the darkest speculations.

We believe that the American people have had enough. More than enough.

We therefore call upon Richard Nixon, President of the United States, to resign.

We ask him to resign in the interest of preserving our democratic system of government, which requires a relationship of trust and candor between the people and their political leaders.

We ask him to resign in the interest of restoring a fully functioning government, which his Administration is too deeply in disarray to provide.

We ask him to resign in the interest of national security.

If Mr. Nixon does not resign, we call upon the House of Representatives forthwith to initiate impeachment proceedings against him.

We also call upon the Congress to hold up further consideration of the President's Vice President-designate, Mr. Ford. Clearly, a President who has placed himself on the brink of impeachment should not be allowed to name his successor until the charges against him have been disposed of satisfactorily.

We concur completely with Archibald Cox, who said at the time of his dismissal: "Whether we shall continue to be a government of laws and not of men is now for Congress and ultimately the American people to decide."

Impeachment is not a prospect we contemplate with pleasure. No decent American can derive any partisan satisfaction whatever from the misfortune of his nation. And surely the American labor movement is not interested in aiding any reckless attacks on the Presidency. We are especially concerned about the office of the Presidency in these times of grave danger on the international front.

But the cause of peace and freedom in the world cannot be served by a discredited Presidency at home. Our allies' best hope—mankind's best hope—lies in the strength of our democratic institutions.

Justice must be done, the risks of not doing it being more than a democracy can safely bear.

LABOR DELEGATES ARE NOT SATISFIED—CONSTITUTIONAL CRISIS CALLED UNRESOLVED BY NIXON MOVE

(By Philip Shabecoff)

BAL HARBOUR, FLA., Oct. 23.—Delegates to the A.F.L.-C.I.O. convention here, who voted yesterday to ask President Nixon to resign, were startled but not satisfied today when they learned that the President had decided to surrender the Watergate tape recordings to a Federal judge.

The news broke just after the convention adjourned, and George Meany, president of the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, said he would have no comment for the time being.

But other delegates said that they felt the President's reversal had not resolved the constitutional crisis and raised still more questions about the President's stability. Jerry Wurf, President of the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees, called the President's action one more illustration of the frightening irresponsibility of this man.

Mr. Wurf said that he took some comfort from the fact that the President had obviously seen that the American people "would not sit still for the kind of games he was playing." But the union leader added that the President must resign or be impeached.

ADDRESS BY HUMPHREY

Earlier, in an address to the convention, Senator Hubert H. Humphrey accused President Nixon of being a "man obsessed with power" and warned that "our existence as a

democracy and our constitutional tradition of balanced and limited power are in mortal danger as of this hour."

Former Vice President Humphrey, after reviewing the recent actions of the President, asserted that "this pattern of behavior of exercising unrestrained power is dangerous; it is dictatorial; it is unacceptable for a free people."

The Minnesota Democrat who ran against Mr. Nixon in 1968, called on Congress and the judiciary to "act responsibly" to resolve the crisis of the Presidency.

He said that a new special prosecutor should be appointed either by Federal Judge John J. Sirica or by a special act of Congress and that the prosecutor should be given full access to evidence and all independent powers to carry forth the Watergate case.

"It is essential that this new inquiry be beyond the political reach of the President," Mr. Humphrey said.

He also urged "appropriate committees" of Congress to hold hearings quickly on impeachment motions filed by members of the House of Representatives. However, Senator Humphrey did not urge impeachment himself, explaining that as a Senator he would have to sit as judge or jury, if the House voted impeachment and that he did not want to "prejudge this case."

UNION ISSUES FADE

This tenth biennial convention of the A.F.L.-C.I.O. was dominated by the Presidential crisis to the extent that trade union issues faded almost into the background, at least on the floor of the meeting itself.

The only other major issue on the floor during this final day of the convention was the Middle East. It was not a controversial issue.

The convention voted unanimously for a resolution condemning what it said was Arab aggression against Israel, praising Israel's free democratic society and called on the United States Government to carry out a "massive airlift" of all equipment and supplies needed by Israel to replace her losses.

The convention also passed a resolution condemning the "violence" and "suppression" of the military junta in Chile and asked the United States Government to take diplomatic measures to speed the re-establishment of civilian rule and full political and trade union rights in that South American country.

DISTINGUISHED NEWSPAPERMAN WILLIAM B. STREET PASSES

HON. DAN KUYKENDALL

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 24, 1973

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Mr. Speaker, it is my sad task at this time to announce to my colleagues, and particularly to those from the Mid-South area, that we have lost a friend and a distinguished newspaperman. I have just been informed of the death, this morning, of William B. Street, the political editor of the Memphis Commercial Appeal.

Those of us in public life who knew Bill Street can testify that honesty and fair play in journalism has lost one of its most devoted advocates. I think it fitting, and the way he would have wanted it, that he died at his typewriter in the Commercial Appeal newsroom, of a heart attack.

I will ask for a special order in the House next Tuesday, and invite those Members who knew him to join me in a

tribute to a friend and outstanding journalist.

WHO IS AT FAULT

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 24, 1973

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, it is very easy to blame all problems, real and imaginary, on others. We in public service recognize that while we deserve criticism for many of the problems that government has failed to solve, we are often criticized for events over which we have little or any control.

Harry "Scoop" Sklenar is a veteran journalist and editor of the Des Plaines Valley News, serving a number of constituents in my congressional district. His column of Thursday, October 18, is a truly penetrating, philosophical commentary which I am pleased to insert into the RECORD:

WHO IS AT FAULT

(By Harry Sklenar)

It was said that Diogenes spent a lifetime with a lantern seeking an honest man and failed. And a great Teacher told a crowd, "Whom among you without sin shall cast the first stone?" and none complied.

Perhaps Diogenes looked only in the high elective offices of the land, judging from recent disclosures of a top judge being termed guilty of accepting racing stock at below cost for allegedly securing favorable racing dates, reading that a U.S. Vice President pleaded no contest to charges of income tax evasion, and those Chicago policemen and their superior who were found guilty of gathering regular pay-offs from tavern owners.

Note, it takes two persons to complete a dishonest deal; one, the person making the offer, and another, the person accepting. Why is it so seldom that the person making the offer is given some form of punishment?

Perhaps we are all at fault for maintaining a society in which such acts are tolerated, becoming more acceptable rather than the exception to the point of having a relative add a device to a model car a youngster had allegedly constructed to assure victory.

Thus rather than cast a cynical eye on those holding political office and stating the system is rotten, remember it was you and I who make it so. We nominate the office holders, then endeavor to blemish their characters with wild accusations unrelated to their ability, then discover that few persons of high moral character and caliber care to even make a campaign try.

Currently, the Illinois state legislature is to consider a stronger ethics bill, yet the Governor, while backing the bill, is refusing to disclose the names of his own campaign contributors.

During the last decade, our character and moral principles dropped considerably. Today, we have states adding revenue from running lotteries with a portion of such revenue going to schools, then holding that gambling is wrong. Besides the gambling issue, we have the U.S. Supreme Court ruling on obscenity issues.

How many blemishes do you have on your character? Why not just take a casual observation on how many times you wished to hand a policeman some money for not writing that arrest ticket, or buying a magazine or book purely because it exhibits nude photos, or by attending films of that nature? To what extent have you added to the sales

volume of cigarettes when printed warnings advise you desist? Cigarette sales have been on the increase despite those warnings of being detrimental to your health.

While seeking to curtail the selling and smoking of cigarettes on one hand, we attempt to legalize the smoking of marijuana on the other. We jail persons for race horse betting outside of the track and hold it is perfectly legal for betting inside.

We learn that TV exhibitors hold that portrayals of violence and criminal methods have no effect on children, yet use this same media to aid children to learn to read and use television in schools to aid in the child's learning process.

It is strange that mankind has survived this long without introducing sex lessons at the grade school level, or taking surveys on bedtime practices.

If we take to blaming politicians for the state of evil, society or the system, remember it is just the mass of individuals such as you and I which make up society and formulate that system.

This means that each of us is responsible to stop these evil practices simply because "everyone else is doing it." Look at your own conscience and let that be your guide.

PROVOST MARSHAL GENERAL RAMSEY

HON. TIM LEE CARTER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 24, 1973

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a pleasure to share with the Members of this body an impressive monograph on Provost Marshal General Ramsey, which appeared recently in the Government Executive.

Gen. Lloyd B. Ramsey is originally from my congressional district and I am proud to say has had an outstanding and distinguished career as a true leader.

The article follows:

PROVOST MARSHAL GENERAL RAMSEY

Ernie Pyle, the late famed war correspondent, once had this to say about the caliber of troops in the U.S. Army's Military Police Corps during World War II:

"The Military Police haven't the taint to them that they did in the last war. This time, they're a specially picked, highly trained permanent organization."

"From the MPs I saw, judging by their demeanor and their conduct, I believe that, next to Rangers and Paratroopers, they really are the pick of the Army."

While many veterans of World War II and subsequent wars can attest to the effectiveness of the Military Police Corps in maintaining troop discipline and promoting law and order within the Army, few ex-soldiers are likely to recall that their infrequent dealings with MPs were noticeably friendly.

But then breaking up saloon brawls involving drunken GIs, bawling out military drivers who are causing traffic jams, collaring troops who are absent without leave, and thwarting supply thieves (with which any army abounds) hardly are activities designed to enhance the MPs' popularity.

The role of MPs vis-a-vis the rest of the Army, however, has been changing in recent years, according to Maj. Gen. Lloyd B. Ramsey, whose command includes the Military Police Corps.

"We've increasingly emphasized the training of the MP to be a friend of the soldier," Ramsey said, "and standards for becoming an

MP are much higher than those of the average soldier."

Today's MP, he said, spends as much or more time trying to keep soldiers out of trouble as he does dealing after the fact with flagrant lawbreakers or troublemakers. The emphasis is on choosing MP recruits who are sensitive to soldiers' problems.

Both in military police school, which is not under Ramsey's command, and throughout the Corps worldwide, heavy emphasis is placed upon human relations training and the application of psychological principles rather than force where possible in achieving Corps goals.

Ramsey said that in his three years as Provost Marshal General he has "tried to get out in the field as much as possible because that's where you find out what the problems are."

VISITS WITH A PURPOSE

He said, "These aren't inspection trips. They are trips I take to find out how we at the headquarters level can assist our people in the field to do a better job."

"We found, for example, that the vehicles the MPs were using were in terrible shape."

"Now we have what we call a law enforcement sedan going out to field installations. It has a bigger motor to support power demands of more sophisticated communications equipment, the siren, lights and so on. It has heavier upholstery because MPs continually have to get in and out of a vehicle and this is hard on the upholstery. And there are other features that will give MPs more maneuverability."

Among other activities or proposed changes prompted by the field visits:

"A study is now under way of our entire communications system—what types of radios should be installed in which of our cars, for example?"

The MPs uniform is being studied with an eye to making it more functional—"the dress uniform now is simply too restricting considering the vigorous activities MPs sometimes have to engage in. Also I think we're going to go to a badge instead of the traditional arm brassard."

The Corps, which is responsible for investigating misdemeanors but not felony crimes, has established a job slot for a "military police investigator" (MPI).

"Their big job is crime prevention," Ramsey said, "and they've done a tremendous job. We put them in civilian clothes or uniforms of some other branch if necessary. The MPIs broke up a mugging operation near one post theater. Another time, they shut down a house of prostitution being run by a service club."

The Military Police Corps is considering replacing its combat .45-caliber pistol with the .38 used by most civilian police which is less lethal in crowd situations and easier to handle.

Ramsey noted that military crime rates often rise and fall in patterns similar to those of the civilian population. During the past fiscal year, he said, Army crime rates have been on a downward trend, except for marijuana use offenses which have increased.

The office of Provost Marshal General also has responsibility for correction, custody, and rehabilitation of military prisoners, physical security of installations, traffic control involving military operations, handling of prisoners of war and civilian internees during wartime, apprehension of absentees and civil disturbance and disaster control.

Some 1100 longterm military prisoners are held in the Army's disciplinary barracks at Ft. Leavenworth, Kan. About 1000 prisoners given sentences of six months or less are now with the Army's Retraining Brigade at Ft. Riley, Kan., where, hopefully, they will be rehabilitated and later returned to duty.

"The latest psychological, sociological, educational and vocational ideas are applied in

our rehabilitation program," Ramsey said. "They get humane motivational training and are kept up to date in basic combat techniques. If they don't make progress we discharge them after their sentence is up. But we have had a high degree of success with this effort."

Before the job was turned over to the Defense Supply Agency in July, Ramsey's office provided physical security advice to vital defense industries, and such surveys, he said, "kept me on the road a lot."

Maintaining security of arms rooms and other Army supply facilities remains a difficult problem, Ramsey said. He added, "We are always studying the newest types of locking and intrusion detection devices."

Army deserters have a tougher time staying out of Ft. Leavenworth these days. A data file on deserters and absentees is maintained at Ft. Benjamin Harrison, Ind., and linked to the FBI's National Crime Information Center. "A man now can be picked up for a traffic violation somewhere and turn up as a deserter when they run it through the NCIC," Ramsey said.

Ramsey, 55, saw extensive combat during World War II, received multiple wounds, was awarded the Distinguished Service Medal and many other citations and decorations, and rose to infantry regiment and division staff posts. During 1969, he commanded the 23rd Infantry Division in Vietnam.

The word "leadership" crops up frequently when Ramsey is talking. He considers vigor and the ability to communicate two of the more important attributes of a good leader. A former athlete, he himself remains vigorous by working out in the gym regularly and playing badminton and golf. And his visits to the field help keep communications lines open.

"If a young man gets good leadership," Ramsey said, "he is going to be a good soldier. It is as simple as that."

ROBISON CALLS FOR INDEPENDENT "SPECIAL PROSECUTOR"

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 24, 1973

Mr. ROBISON of New York. Mr. Speaker, upon hearing that President Nixon agreed, this afternoon, to turn the White House tapes over to Judge Sirica in compliance with the court of appeals affirmative decision, one of my House colleagues said, "Whew, what a helluva high-wire act."

My own reaction is somewhat comparable for, though I have been cautioning both my constituents and myself to cool it insofar as early tendencies to conclude that the President, by his actions last weekend, had "put himself above the law" and was moving—in the words of the Waldie impeachment resolution as introduced in the House today—"knowingly and wilfully to obstruct justice" were concerned, it was obvious all along that the President had precipitated one of the most serious constitutional crises ever to plague and divide this Nation.

It will be difficult, now, to put back the pieces. Not all of them probably can be put back. Two of the brighter stars in the Nixon administration—Elliot Richardson and William French Smith—have left their posts and, at the moment

at least, we are without a special prosecutor to carry on the Watergate investigation with some assurance that, in the end, the full truth about Watergate would come out.

As to the latter problem, Congress should probably move now to do what it might better have done in the beginning—that is, to establish, through legislation, an independent special prosecutor for the purpose of completing the Watergate investigation who would not, then, be answerable, as was Archibald Cox, to the executive branch. It is largely hindsight, but it has seemed to me to have been an anomalous situation in which we placed Mr. Cox—that is, to charge him, as an employee of the executive branch—and, clearly, subject to removal from office by the President—to investigate that same executive branch all the way up to its top. From the beginning, this put the President and Mr. Cox in an awkward situation—an adversary situation—in which a confrontation like that which has now occurred was probably inevitable.

I have no way of knowing if Mr. Cox would resume his investigatory work into Watergate should Congress now so reestablish the special prosecutor post but that is at least a possibility. The chances of bringing either Mr. Richardson or Mr. Ruckelshaus back into Federal service are probably more remote, but they will be missed.

Looking back, I believe a number of things need to be said in behalf of the President. There are those, of course, who will give Mr. Nixon no quarter. To them—and this includes a number of my constituents who have contacted me over the weekend—the only reason the President did not earlier release the disputed tapes was because they must have been dangerously self-incriminating. As to that, we shall soon now see. But my earlier response was, if the tapes would have so incriminated the President why, then, did he agree to let Senator STENNIS hear them in their entirety? In point of fact, I now repeat what I also said, earlier in the weekend, to the effect that I felt the so-called Stennis compromise was not all that bad if what we really wanted to know from the tapes was the depth, if any, of Presidential involvement in either organizing Watergate or directing its subsequent attempted cover-up. If the major question was over whether Judge Sirica or Senator STENNIS should hear the tapes, it was not on that ground, alone, that the President could be found to have moved "to obstruct justice."

Of more serious import, here, is the question—still unresolved—of the President's meaning in, at the same time, denying Mr. Cox access to other White House documents and material that might be pertinent to the Watergate inquiry. Perhaps Mr. Nixon will also backtrack now on this issue, as I think he should, though another way around that impasse—if it persists—would be through passage of the kind of law Prof. Alexander Bickel, of Yale, has suggested giving the Federal courts jurisdiction to enforce congressional subpoenas. If we go

that route, along with legislation recreating the independent special prosecutor post, it is clear that the President has not—as some have charged—put the executive branch above the other two branches of our Federal Government, nor could he do so if we are serious about pressing these matters.

Further, in the President's behalf, it needs to be suggested, at least, that he felt his proposed compromise was within the spirit, if not the letter, of the original Sirica decision as somewhat modified by the court of appeals. In my own judgment, this would have been obvious to all if, at the time of advancing that compromise, Mr. Nixon had also filed a timely appeal to the Supreme Court from the court of appeals decision. I cannot imagine that he did not get such advice for it would not only have been a necessary and proper legal move, but would also have avoided giving the appearance—with his compromise being considered as the judicial process moved on—of having put himself, on a take-it-or-leave-it basis, "above the law." Though this is water-over-the-dam, if such a course had been followed, I doubt that Mr. Cox would have felt it necessary to balk as he did, with his resulting dismissal followed by the Richardson resignation and the Ruckelshaus dismissal.

What all this points up once again, I feel, is that, despite the personnel changes that have been made in upper White House staff echelons, the President still remains too isolated both from public opinion and from those who, at least on occasion, could give him wise political advice.

In summary, the President sought to do what he thought was right but, in the manner chosen, botched the doing of it. With gratification and relief, I welcome the corrections in position he made today.

One final word about that question of impeachment: With alarm, did I note how readily that word sprang to so many lips—with scarcely a thought to the actual consequences, or to what such a traumatic experience, long-drawn out as it would be, would also be for a Nation already beset by so many serious problems and challenges both at home and abroad. I do not question the motives of those of my colleagues who have led today's impeachment drive, but it should be clear to all objective observers that, with the Vice Presidency now vacant, something like a political coup d'etat was being initiated and organized in an effort to overturn the mandate given by the electorate last fall which, if not given Mr. Nixon personally, was given in support of the political philosophy he was thought to generally espouse.

The President is not out of the Watergate woods yet—perhaps he never will be. But, if consideration must again be given to his impeachment on whatever grounds, let it be done only after the most mature and deliberative of thought on all our parts including that of the news media, large portions of which—over these past few days—came close to succumbing to that kind of advocacy

journalism against which one of its own most distinguished spokesmen, Walter Cronkite, warned here in Washington only last week.

MENACE OF MULTINATIONAL CORPORATIONS

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 24, 1973

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, there is increasing concern over what effect the growth of American multinational corporations have on the American worker and the economy of the United States. Presently, there are hearings being conducted in the U.S. Senate on this very question.

I deem it appropriate, therefore, to insert into the RECORD for the consideration of my colleagues a resolution adopted by the 38th UE International Convention. The resolution appeared in the October 8 issue of the UE News.

The resolution follows:

MENACE OF MULTINATIONAL CORPORATIONS

A resolution on "The Menace of the Multinational Corporations" adopted by the 38th UE International Convention pointed out that these corporations now hold nearly \$300 billion in cash reserves, more than twice as much as held by all central banks and monetary institutions.

This huge financial power is used to dictate policy to governments, menace workers and even the independence of nations.

One million American jobs were lost within five years as these corporations moved operations to cheap wage areas outside the U.S. The electronics industry was one specifically mentioned by the U.S. Tariff Commission as the center of such expansion away from the United States.

The convention resolution emphasizes that the interests of working people in foreign countries and those in the United States "can only be advanced by organizing and standing up to these Multi national corporations together." Such solidarity would help stop the attempts of the corporations to pit workers of one country against those of another "hammering down their standards of living and conditions of work."

The resolution calls for the UE to establish contact with foreign unions "in line with its policy of no discrimination as to ideology, in order to determine what cooperative steps must be taken to curb the power of the multi national corporations."

That UE together with foreign unions encourage and assist the organization of unions where employees of such corporations are presently organized.

That UE fight the propaganda of those corporations which try to represent themselves as benevolent promoters of world peace and prosperity.

That the UE support legislation designed to curb the power of the multi-national corporations, such as the following provisions of the Burke-Hartke bill:

"(a) Compelling U.S. companies to pay U.S. income taxes on foreign profits whether or not the profits are returned to the U.S.

"(b) Repealing the U.S. tax credit allowed companies on foreign taxes.

"(c) Preventing the use of accelerated depreciation for overseas equipment.

"(d) Taxing the transfer of patents to overseas plants.

"(e) Empowering the President to ban the transfer overseas of capital and technology.

"(f) Repealing the sections of the tariff code that provide an incentive for U.S. manufacturers to ship components across the border to low wage nations for assembling and other production.

"(g) Compelling officials of U.S. international corporations employed abroad to pay U.S. income taxes on their earnings abroad.

"(h) Repealing the overseas Private Investment Corporation which insures multinationals against the loss of the foreign investments."

Finally, the resolution states: "At all times, the UE should take the position that international organization of the workers themselves, not legislation, is the only effective way to deal with the multi-national corporations."

NO MORE HONORARY OR COURTESY APPOINTMENTS TO ADVISORY COMMITTEES

HON. DAVID R. OBEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 24, 1973

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, a letter in the October 19 issue of Science notes that Frank Sinatra accepted appointment to the National Advisory Heart and Lung Council to fill a 1-year unexpired term, then did not attend council meetings or contribute to the council's work between meetings.

The letter-writer, Julius H. Comroe, Jr., of the Cardiovascular Research Institute, School of Medicine, University of California at San Francisco, explains that he is bringing the matter to public attention, now that Mr. Sinatra's term has expired, for this reason:

Simply in the hope that the public may ask the secretary of H.E.W. that there be no more honorary or courtesy appointments to working councils whose responsibilities require the dedicated efforts of all its members.

I think that his point is a good one, and I ask that his letter be printed in full.

The letter follows:

CARDIOVASCULAR RESEARCH INSTITUTE, SCHOOL OF MEDICINE, UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA,
San Francisco, Calif.

APPOINTMENTS TO WORKING GOVERNMENT COUNCILS

In December 1972, Frank Sinatra was appointed a member of the National Advisory Heart and Lung Council, to fill a 1-year unexpired term. This council, by law, consists of 5 ex officio members and 18 members appointed by the secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW). The National Heart, Blood Vessel, Lung and Blood Act of 1972 states that 5 of the 18 "shall be selected from members of the general public who are leaders in the fields of fundamental or medical sciences or in public affairs." Neither I nor any other council member questions the principle of appointing nonscientists to the council, or the wisdom shown by the secretary of HEW in the appointment of any individual. However, the scientists on the council do have a right to expect full participation of all members in the heavy work load of the council, and to expect that the nonscientists will bring new concepts and fresh points of view to the council's discussions—and express these effectively. The council must meet from four

to six times a year, and members must spend much time between meetings on the council's business.

Mr. Sinatra accepted appointment to the council but did not attend even part of the four council meetings held since then (15 to 17 March, 29 and 30 March, 13 to 15 June, and 17 and 18 September), nor did he contribute to the council's work between meetings. Since his term has now expired, why bring the matter to public attention? Simply in the hope that the public may ask the secretary of HEW that there be no more honorary or courtesy appointments to working councils whose responsibilities require the dedicated efforts of all its members. Surely the government can find ways to honor those whose special talents or contributions deserve recognition without lessening the effectiveness and prestige of its working councils.

JULIUS H. COMROE, JR.

OFFICE OF CONGRESSIONAL LEGAL COUNSEL NEEDED TO CHALLENGE ILLEGAL EXECUTIVE ACTIONS

HON. BELLA S. ABZUG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 24, 1973

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, over the past several years we have witnessed an escalating succession of illegal actions on the part of the executive branch—actions flaunting the laws of the United States, the will of the Congress, and most importantly the trust of the American people.

The President's firing of Special Prosecutor Archibald Cox, in violation of a solemn agreement between the Attorney General and the Senate, is merely the most recent of these arbitrary and illegal acts. Mr. Nixon's seizing of evidence, material to the investigation of the Federal grand jury, his violation of the first and fourth amendment rights of U.S. citizens by sanctioning an elaborate series of wiretaps, burglaries, and espionage, his interference with the judicial branch during the Ellsberg-Russo trial, his illegal use of campaign funds to insure his reelection, his impounding of more than \$40 billion in funds for domestic programs, and his authorization of secret bombing in Cambodia represent some of the President's illegal actions during the past year.

Today I have introduced legislation that would enable Members of both Houses of Congress as elective officials to challenge illegal executive actions in the courts through the mechanism of Congressional Legal Counsel. This bill, establishing an Office of Congressional Legal Counsel, is similar to legislation introduced by Mr. MONDALE in the other body.

The head of the Office of Congressional Legal Counsel would be appointed by the Speaker of the House and the President pro tempore of the Senate, from among names submitted by the majority and minority leaders of the House and Senate. Duties of the Counsel would include a variety of informational and representational activities.

First, he—or she—would be required, upon request of either House of Congress,

a joint committee, a committee, at least 3 Senators or 12 Representatives, to render a legal opinion on questions arising under the Constitution and laws of the United States. These questions would include whether:

A request for information or inspection of records under the Freedom of Information Act was properly denied by an agency of the U.S. Government;

A nomination, or an agreement with a foreign country or regional or international organization, should have been submitted to the Senate for its advice and consent;

An activity has been undertaken or continued, or not undertaken or continued, by the executive branch of the U.S. Government in violation of the law or the Constitution or without any required authorization of law; and

Funds appropriated by Congress have been impounded in accordance with law.

Second, he would be required, upon requests from any of the same types of parties above, to advise and cooperate with other private parties bringing civil actions against officers and employees of the executive branch, or any agency or department thereof, regarding their execution of the laws and Constitution.

Third, he would be required, upon a similar request, to intervene or appear as amicus curiae in pending actions in Federal or State courts in which the issue is the constitutionality or interpretation of a law of the United States, or the validity of any official proceeding or official action taken by either House of Congress, joint committees, committees or members, or any officer or employee of the Congress.

Fourth, upon request, he would be required to represent either House, a joint committee, committee, Member or employee of Congress in any legal action pending to which such House, committee, or employee is a party, and in which there is placed in issue the validity of any official proceeding of, or official action taken by, such House, committee, member, or employee.

Fifth, and most importantly, if the Congressional Legal Counsel has rendered a legal opinion, and if requested by either House, a joint committee, a committee, at least 6 Senators or at least 24 Representatives, he would be required "to bring a civil action, without regard to the sum or value of the matter in controversy, in a court of the United States to require an officer or employee of the executive branch of the U.S. Government, or any agency or department thereof, to act in accordance with the Constitution and laws of the United States as interpreted in such opinion."

The Congressional Legal Counsel, therefore, would be empowered to undertake a wide variety of activity, including representing the Congress and individual Members both as plaintiffs and defendants.

Most importantly, the bill would provide the Congress with an effective legal voice in combating illegal executive branch actions such as impoundment, overly broad claims of Executive privilege, failure to submit nominations to the

Senate for confirmation, and other similar abuses.

The statute would confer broad standing on the Office of Congressional Counsel in its representational activity, so as to afford the Congress with wide-ranging authority in challenging executive branch action in the courts.

Just as the Office of Legislative Counsel has, over the years, aided Members of the House and Senate in developing important legislation, so should an Office of Congressional Legal Counsel aid us in reasserting the power which we need to insure that this legislative function is carried out by an often balky executive branch.

Mr. Speaker, I insert the text of the bill I have introduced at this point in the RECORD:

H.R. —

A bill establishing an Office of Congressional Legal Counsel

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for purposes of this Act—

(1) "Member of Congress" means a Senator, Representative, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner;

(2) "Member of the House of Representatives" includes a Representative, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner;

(3) "State" includes any territory or possession of the United States; and

(4) "Impounding of budget authority" includes—

(A) withholding, delaying, deferring, freezing, or otherwise refusing to expend any part of budget authority made available (whether by establishing reserves or otherwise) and the termination or cancellation of authorized projects or activities to the extent that budget authority has been made available;

(B) withholding, delaying, deferring, freezing, or otherwise refusing to make any allocation of any part of budget authority (where such allocation is required in order to permit the budget authority to be expended or obligated);

(C) withholding, delaying, deferring, freezing, or otherwise refusing to permit a grantee to obligate any part of budget authority (whether by establishing contract controls, reserves, or otherwise); and

(D) any type of Executive action or inaction which effectively precludes or delays the obligation or expenditure of any part of authorized budget authority.

Sec. 2. (a) There is established within the Congress the Office of Congressional Legal Counsel, which shall be under the direction and control of the Congressional Legal Counsel. The Congressional Legal Counsel shall be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President pro tempore of the Senate from among recommendations submitted by the majority and minority leaders of the House of Representatives and the Senate. Such appointment shall be made without regard to political affiliation and solely on the basis of his fitness to perform the duties of his office. The Congressional Legal Counsel shall receive basic pay at the rate provided for level III of the Executive Schedule under section 5314 of title 5, United States Code.

(b) The Congressional Legal Counsel may appoint and fix the compensation of such Assistant Legal Counsels and other personnel as may be necessary to carry on the work of his office. All such appointments shall be made without regard to political affiliation and solely on the basis of fitness to perform the duties of their office.

(c) The Congressional Legal Counsel shall promulgate for his office such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the duties imposed upon him by this Act. He may delegate authority for the performance of any such duty to any officer or employee of the Office of the Congressional Legal Counsel. No person serving as an officer or employee of such office may engage in any other business, vocation, or employment while so serving.

(d) The Congressional Legal Counsel shall cause a seal of office to be made for his office, of such design as the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President pro tempore of the Senate shall approve, and judicial notice shall be taken thereof.

Sec. 3. (a) It shall be the duty of the Congressional Legal Counsel—

(1) to render, upon request of either House of Congress, a joint committee of Congress, any committee of either House of Congress, at least three Senators, or twelve Members of the House of Representatives, legal opinions upon questions arising under the Constitution and laws of the United States, including but not limited to, whether—

(A) a request for information or inspection of a record or other matter under section 552 of title 5, United States Code, was properly denied by an agency of the United States Government;

(B) a nomination, or an agreement with a foreign country or regional or international organization, should have been submitted to the Senate for its advice and consent;

(C) an activity has been undertaken or continued, or not undertaken or continued, by the executive branch of the United States Government in violation of the law or the Constitution or without any required authorization of law;

(D) a budget authority has been impounded in accordance with law;

(2) upon the request of either House of Congress, a joint committee of Congress, any committee of either House of Congress, at least three Senators, or at least twelve Members of the House of Representatives—

(A) to advise and to consult and cooperate with parties bringing civil actions against officers and employees of the executive branch of the United States Government or any agency or department thereof, with respect to their execution of the laws, and the Constitution of the United States; and

(B) to intervene or appear as amicus curiae on behalf of persons making such request in any action pending in any court of the United States or of a State or political subdivision thereof, in which there is placed in issue the constitutionality or interpretation of any law of the United States, or the validity of any law of the United States, or the validity of any official proceeding of, or official action taken by, either House of Congress, a joint committee of Congress, any committee of either House of Congress, or a Member of Congress, or any officer, employee, office, or agency of the Congress;

(3) to represent, upon request, either House of Congress, a joint committee of Congress, any committee of either House of Congress, a Member of Congress, or any officer, employee, office, or agency of the Congress in any legal action pending in any court of the United States or of a State or political subdivision thereof to which such House, joint committee, committee member, officer, employee, office, or agency is a party and in which there is placed in issue the validity of any official proceeding of, or official action taken by, such House, joint committee, committee member, officer, employee, office, or agency; and

(4) if an opinion has been rendered in accordance with subparagraph (1) of this section, and upon request of either House of

Congress, a joint committee of Congress, any committee of either House of Congress, at least six Senators, or at least twenty-four Members of the House of Representatives, to bring civil actions, without regard to the sum or value of the matter in controversy, in a court of the United States to require an officer or employee of the executive branch of the United States Government, or any agency or department thereof, to act in accordance with the Constitution and laws of the United States as interpreted in such opinion.

(b) Upon receipt of written notice from the Congressional Legal Counsel to the effect that he has undertaken, pursuant to subsection (a) (3) of this section, to perform any such specified representational service with respect to any designated action or proceeding pending or to be instituted, the Attorney General shall be relieved of responsibility and shall have no authority to perform such service in such action or proceeding except at the request or with the approval of the Congressional Legal Counsel.

Sec. 4. (a) Permission to intervene or to file a brief amicus curiae under section 3 (a) (2) (B) of this Act shall be of right, and may be denied by a court only upon an express finding that such intervention or filing is untimely and would significantly delay the pending action.

(b) Where an actual case or controversy exists, persons making requests under section 3(a)(4) of this Act shall have the right to obtain judicial review of the conduct in question without regard to the requirements for standing as set forth in any statutes, rules, or other requirement of standing.

(c) For the purpose of all proceedings incident to the trial and review of any action described by subsection (a) (3) of section 3 with respect to which the Congressional Legal Counsel has undertaken to provide representational service, and has so notified the Attorney General, the Congressional Legal Counsel shall have all powers conferred by law upon the Attorney General, any subordinate of the Attorney General, or any United States attorney.

(d) The Congressional Legal Counsel, or any attorney of his office designated by him for that purpose, shall be entitled for the purpose of performing duties imposed upon him pursuant to this Act to enter an appearance in any such proceeding before any court of the United States without compliance with any requirement for admission to practice before such court, except that the authorization conferred by this subsection shall not apply with respect to the admission of any person to practice before the United States Supreme Court.

Sec. 5. All legal opinions rendered by the Congressional Legal Counsel under section 3(a) (1) of this Act shall be published and made available for public inspection under such rules and regulations as the Congressional Legal Counsel shall promulgate.

Sec. 6. (a) Section 3210 of title 39, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by inserting immediately after "respective terms of office" the following: "the Congressional Legal Counsel,"; and

(2) by inserting immediately before "or Legislative Counsel" the following: "Congressional Legal Counsel."

(b) Section 3216(a) of such title is amended by inserting immediately before "and Legislative Counsel" the following: "Congressional Legal Counsel."

Sec. 7. There are authorized to be appropriated to the Office of the Congressional Legal Counsel such sums as may be necessary for the performance of the duties of the Congressional Legal Counsel under this Act. Amounts so appropriated shall be disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate on vouchers approved by the Congressional Legal Counsel.

DOUBLES IRON CONTENT OF WHITE BREAD

HON. RAY ROBERTS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 24, 1973

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, the Food and Drug Administration has taken action which could endanger the health of all Americans.

After 3 years of controversy and in the face of dire warnings from competent hematologists, the FDA has ordered the Nation's bakeries to double the iron content of white bread.

One California hematologist has pointed out, obviously to no avail, that excess iron in the body can produce cirrhosis of the liver and pancreas, heart failure, diabetes, and impotence in males. Another physician who has treated iron-related disorders predicted that many Americans would have an iron overload in 10 years.

The FDA Commissioner admits that there is legitimate concern about our getting too much iron in our diets, but he still favors the regulation, because his research shows that Americans are not getting enough iron in their diets.

The Commissioner's concern about deficiencies in the diets of Americans is admirable, but his dictatorial act to make them consume more iron at a risk to life and health is unthinkable.

It may be all right with the American Bakers Association if we start getting medication at the grocery store instead of the local pharmacy, but I believe that most Americans would be more interested in the approval of hematologists, the real specialists in this area.

"No official comments were received from national or international hematological societies," wrote the FDA in its regulation. That is hardly reason to assume the silent approval of responsible spokesmen in this field of medicine.

The order also sets higher iron levels for enriched bread and rolls and for enriched dough. It reads:

The Commissioner, on his own initiative, proposed that the standard for enriched bread, rolls, or buns also be amended by inserting the statement that iron and calcium may be added only in forms which are harmless and assimilable.

Unfortunately, what is harmless and assimilable is obviously open to debate. The FDA proposal has considerable support among the medical profession. But, there is also significant opposition from others in that same medical profession. The potential harm in adding to the iron content of bread is simply too important to be ignored.

It should not be the right of any Federal bureaucracy or any one bureaucrat to use the American public as human guinea pigs in a dietary supplement experiment.

I urge my colleagues to read the following United Press International account of the FDA action as it appeared in the October 13 edition of the Tyler, Tex., Morning Telegraph, one of the outstanding newspapers in my district.

DOUBLE RATION OF IRON DUE IN CONTENT OF WHITE BREAD

WASHINGTON.—In an order criticized by some doctors as a dangerous human experiment, the government Friday ordered the nation's bakeries to double the iron content of white bread.

The Food and Drug Administration said it was issuing the order, after three years of study and controversy, because research indicated Americans are not getting enough iron in their diet—partly because of the declining use of iron cookware. It will go into effect in six months.

Dr. William H. Crosby, chief of hematology at the Scripps Clinic in La Jolla, Calif., said there has been "absolutely no work done" to demonstrate that more iron in bread would be safe or effective.

"The manufacturers would not and could not provide such evidence," he said. "The fact that it may not be safe is really unconscionable."

Crosby said excessive iron can cause cirrhosis of the liver and pancreas, diabetes, heart failure and impotence in males.

Dr. Margaret Ann Krikker of Albany, N.Y., a general practitioner who has treated iron-related disorders and who helped circulate a petition against the proposal signed by more than 100 doctors, told UPI:

"This is an experiment, in my view an irresponsible experiment, unprecedented in the history of mankind . . . I predict a very significant portion of the population will have an iron overload in 10 years."

Dr. Alexander Schmidt, FDA commissioner, told UPI he realized there was "legitimate concern" from physicians who have said the move might result in too much iron in the diet—a potentially dangerous situation since the body can store and use iron but not eliminate it.

But he added: "As people's eating habits change, a significant number of people in the United States are getting less and less iron and becoming anemic. Some very good surveys have shown that as many as a quarter of young women in some areas have iron deficiency anemia . . ."

A spokesman for the American Bakers Association, which asked the FDA to order the change, said, "There are many children and women who are in menstruating years who have diagnosable anemia. This isn't going to cure that overnight, but it will make a very substantial contribution toward that."

The order sets higher iron levels for enriched bread and rolls and for enriched flour dough.

The new level of iron for enriched flour will be 40 milligrams per pound, compared to a present range of 13 to 16.5 mgs; for enriched bread it will be 25 mgs., compared to 8-12.5 presently.

RAW JUDICIAL POWER

HON. EARL F. LANDGREBE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 24, 1973

Mr. LANDGREBE. Mr. Speaker, on September 11 I introduced House Joint Resolution 717 proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States for the protection of unborn children and other persons irrespective of their ages, health, functions or conditions of dependency. Such an amendment is made necessary by the Supreme Court's in-

credible decision last January prohibiting States from enacting laws prohibiting or regulating abortions. Associate Justice White in a dissenting opinion, said:

I find nothing in the language or history of the Constitution to support the Court's judgment. The Court simply fashions and announces a new constitutional right for pregnant mothers and with scarcely any reason or authority for its action, invests that right with sufficient substance to override most existing state abortion statutes.

Mr. Justice White later refers to the Court's decision as "an exercise of raw judicial power" and a more apt description of this decision cannot be made. Because the Supreme Court has abdicated its constitutional duty to interpret law and has elected to enact law, it becomes incumbent upon Congress and the people of these United States to restore the Constitution to its proper place as the basis and foundation of the American system. This can first be accomplished by dispelling the myth that the Constitution is what the Supreme Court says it is. It is Abraham Lincoln who said in his first inaugural address:

If the policy of the Government upon vital questions affecting the whole people is to be irrevocably fixed by decisions of the Supreme Court, the instant they are made in ordinary litigation between parties in personal actions, the people will have ceased to be their own rulers, having to that extent practically resigned their Government into the hands of that eminent tribunal.

The Constitution is most emphatically not what the Supreme Court says it is; the Supreme Court is what the Constitution says the Supreme Court is. Since the Constitution places judicial power and not legislative power in the Supreme Court, one can only conclude that the Supreme Court itself has overstepped the bounds of the Constitution, and that its decision in Roe against Wade is unconstitutional. Those sworn to uphold the Constitution of the United States are obliged by their oaths to perform precisely that action, and are not obliged to uphold a decision of the Supreme Court. Such an oath binds them to the Constitution as they have been given by God to understand the Constitution. Conversely, such an oath binds them to oppose the Supreme Court when the Court has acted unconstitutionally. It is for this reason that I have introduced the resolution proposing a constitutional amendment. As a Representative it is the very least I could do to fulfill the oath I have taken to uphold the Constitution.

B'NAI B'RITH STATEMENT ON MIDEAST CONFLICT

HON. JOE MOAKLEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 24, 1973

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, as I speak to you now, I am heartened by

news of a U.N.-sponsored cease-fire in the Middle East.

I fervently hope this will mean an end to the bloodshed and suffering in that beleaguered part of the world.

Along with other concerned colleagues, I introduced several resolutions in recent days to assist in Israel's defense against overwhelming odds. These measures called for first, an acceleration of the flow of economic and military aid to Israel; second, the initiation of diplomatic action to confine the war to its original combatants and third, an American commitment to bring about a negotiated settlement to the war.

At this time I should like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the following sensitive appraisal of the conflict by the B'nai B'rith Council of Greater Boston:

STATEMENT OF THE B'NAI B'RITH COUNCIL OF
GREATER BOSTON

AN ANALYSIS OF THE CONFLICT

Egypt and Syria have once again chosen to violate a cease fire. Their armed forces crossed the cease fire lines initiating another major war. The battle is still fluid; the outcome uncertain. But surely one must ask why have the Arabs started a war that they are likely to lose?

THE ARAB PLAN

A. Even a small territorial gain would be a victory—if it could be solidified by a U.N. intervention for the establishment of a new cease fire. If the Egyptians, for example, can retain a bridgehead on the East Bank of the Canal, the two armies will no longer be separated by water, and the pressure for an imposed settlement will have been enhanced. The Arabs negotiating stance (if they choose to negotiate) would be stronger. Given the well-known UN pro-Arab bias and the "clout" afforded by Arab oil, a cease fire could be called as soon as the Egyptians consolidated any battle gains. They started this war in order to change the meaning and intent of UN Resolution 242. They seek to impose complete withdrawal of Israeli forces without linking it to a freely negotiated settlement and the establishment of secure boundaries. In this way they hope to set the stage for another round of war.

However, if the Israelis successfully counter-attack into Egyptian and Syrian territory, the Arabs count on the UN to bail them out. No cease fire will be passed by the UN Security Council, unless and until the Egyptians approve it—no matter what they say in public.

B. The Arab aim is to put an end to the State of Israel. As Nasser freely admitted, even the ostensibly limited objectives of today are stepping stones to a definitive solution tomorrow—the destruction of the State of Israel. At the same time, they are secure in the knowledge that no Israeli victory, however swift and large, can threaten the continued existence of any Arab states. The Arabs, therefore, feel, that given the disposition of international power they have everything to gain by attacking Israel. They place little value on human life and can gamble with impunity since the international community is not disposed to restrain them.

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

The attack by Egypt and Syria is only the most recent in a long and unrelenting series of Arab aggressions against Israel going back to the formation of the State.

1. In November 1947 the United Nations voted to partition Palestine. The Arabs re-

fused to accept the decision and immediately began country-wide assaults on the Jewish community in an attempt to "drive the Jews into the sea." In May of 1948, when the UN recognized the State of Israel, the full brunt of Syrian, Egyptian, Jordanian and Iraqi army units was concentrated on Israel in a concerted attack. The result, contrary to general expectation, was an Arab defeat.

2. In the years that followed, the Arab states refused to recognize the existence of Israel and their responsibilities under the UN Charter. After years of terrorist raids from Egyptian territory and Arab refusal to allow Israel its rightful maritime passage through the Suez Canal and also into the Red Sea via the Straits of Tiran the Israeli forces finally reacted and drove to the Suez Canal in 1956. Israel withdrew her forces, only on the basis of UN and other specific international assurances on the use of the Suez Canal and the Red Sea, and the establishment of a UN presence in the Sinai and Sharm-el Sheikh. Nevertheless, immediately upon the Israeli withdrawal, the Egyptians closed the canal to Israeli shipping. The Arabs continued to deny the right of Israel to exist. Terrorists soon resumed incursions along other frontiers. Moreover, the Arabs chose to maintain a "state of belligerency"—which meant that they claim the right to undertake any and all warlike acts. On the other hand the Arabs argued that Israel must be held to their cease fire obligations and had no right to respond.

3. In 1967, President Nasser of Egypt decided the time was ripe to reverse the verdict of 1956. He unilaterally expelled the UN peacekeeping forces from the Sinai; he closed the Straits of Tiran—thus cutting off Israel's lifeline from Eilat to Africa and the Far East, constituting, under international law, an act of war—and poured enormous quantities of armor and infantry into the Sinai right up to Israel's vulnerable front lines.

In Cairo and the other Arab capitals, as American television viewers will recall, officially-inspired mobs paraded carrying banners with the skull and cross bones, and called for "Death to the Jews", while government radio stations interspersed martial airs with a call to "drive the Jews into the sea" and similar blood slogans. On June 5, Israel finally replied, destroying Egyptian and Syrian air power, and after Jordan bombarded Jerusalem, Israel responded to that attack.

In 1967, when Israel did not have defensible borders, she lost more men, proportionately, in 6 days of war than the U.S. lost in 10 years in Indo-China.

Israel and the world, hoped and believed, that this victory, so costly to both sides, would finally bring the Arabs to the negotiating table. But backed by the Russians and their allies in the United Nations, the Arabs attempted instead to rewrite history. They tried to convince the world that they were the victims instead of the criminal aggressors. They tried to regain their lost territory by diplomatic pressure, citing Israel's gains after such Arab attack and subsequent defeat, as evidence of Israel's "expansionist" tendencies—like the boy who killed his parents and asked the court for mercy as an orphan.

4. The Egyptians, who in 1967 were saved by the UN cease fire, broke a cease fire again by initiating massive artillery strikes against Israeli forces in what Nasser called "The War of Attrition". The Egyptians felt that they would wear the Israelis down by trading deaths. When the Israelis refused to acquiesce in their assigned role, and, by air strikes, caused great losses to Egyptian forces, Egypt accepted a cease fire—this time

arranged by the U.S. It was not even a few hours old before the Egyptians boldly used it as a cover for advancing Russian missile launches closer to the Canal in violation of the agreement it had made a few hours before.

5. Now, in October 1973, when they found it politically convenient, they have once again violated the cease fire and initiated hostilities.

CONSEQUENCES

What are the consequences of this Arab aggression likely to be if the Arabs are permitted once more, to escape the responsibilities of their actions?

1. It will make peace harder to achieve. Israel and thoughtful people throughout the world cannot be expected to soon forget this infamous Arab attempt at a Pearl Harbor, which occurred on Yom Kippur, the holiest religious holiday in Judaism.

2. It will confirm Israel's conviction that Arab promises and agreements are not to be relied on; that cease fires are merely tactical conveniences to be shed when no longer wanted; and that the only assurance of safety and survival remains—defensible borders.

The Israelis are the survivors and heirs of the pogroms and concentration camps of Europe, and refugees and heirs of refugees from Arab lands. They have suffered and died enough and will not stand by and allow themselves to be decimated once again. They want and need peace more than the Arabs because they can afford war less and are a peaceful people; but the first step for peace must come from the Arabs.

RESOLVED

A true and lasting peace is now, as it has been in the past, the only sensible goal for U.S. policy in the Middle East.

Because we, as Americans and as Jews, are committed to real peace; because we see clearly the dangers, futility and immorality of continued appeasement of the Arabs, because we are tired of violence and bloodshed, and because, as has been seen over the past 25 years; a truce is meaningless, an armistice is meaningless, a cease fire is meaningless, we declare our firm and unyielding solidarity with the people of Israel in their insistence upon secure, recognized and defensible borders, to be achieved in a settlement of Middle East problems through free and untrammelled negotiations between the parties directly concerned in the conflict.

Therefore, we call upon:

1. All thoughtful people to condemn and oppose the brutal Egyptian/Syrian aggression.

2. The U.S. to accelerate the flow of arms and economic aid to Israel and, in particular, to replace immediately the equipment lost in the current fighting.

3. The President to maintain his long-range policy of the last 3 years, the essence of which is "no imposed solution" to the Middle East conflict.

4. All thoughtful people to recognize that the United Nations has prevented rather than aided the search for peace in the Middle East for 25 years. It has been morally bankrupt in its one-sided pro-Arab resolutions. In its present disposition it has no useful role to play in the resolution of this conflict. We, therefore, urge the U.S. to work for the restoration of the integrity of the UN by acting in accordance with the high ideals on which it was founded—even if we must stand alone.